

THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY

(Continuation of *Eastern Churches Number of "Pax,"*
founded 1931.)

VOL. V

JANUARY-JUNE, 1942

NOS. 1 & 2

CHRISTIAN UNITY AND THE MASS

I.

IN the sacerdotal prayer which is found in St. John (Ch. xvii) Christ explains the meaning and the purpose of His glorious Passion and Death. He takes for granted that the disciples understand that He Himself means to be both the victim and the priest of His sacrifice, His "holymaking." Perhaps we are not accustomed to look in this explanatory prayer for the only full and revealed interpretation of the Redemption. Yet, it is impossible to deny that this interpretation of Christ's is one of the highest moments of Divine Revelation, and that, therefore, it should be at the outset of our theology and spirituality in so far—to say the least—as the Redemption is concerned. Christ says: "And for them do I sanctify myself: that they also may be sanctified in truth." Here we have, then, a supremely personal action, the action of a personal God-Man, which wholly spends itself upon the community of mankind. But this spending is not without purpose. This purpose is set forth with that fulness of simplicity which marks all Christ's divine sayings: "That they all may be one, as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee." All sanctification, every true sacrifice, is essentially the meeting of the divine Holy-maker and the human creature to be made holy. But meeting, or contact, means union. The purpose, then, of the Redemption is to unite the human community within itself and this community to the Father.

With this in mind it is disquieting to see the still widespread lack of interest of Catholics at large in the question of Christian Unity. Great sacrifices have been made for missionary work; in comparison, very little has been done to bring those together who, in the words of His Holiness Pius XII, are united to us in the belief of one God and the love of one Christ. Should not our efforts be first of all

directed towards the restoration of that unity among those who glory in the title of Christians for which Christ died primarily? How dare we boast of our name as Catholics whilst we neglect that unity amongst Christians which alone allows us to be truly Catholics in this world? For without unity, without an integral and all-embracing unity, we cannot be integral and universal—two notions which together mean “Catholic.”

If we really desire to play our part in this world as Catholics we should first of all be as much of one mind among ourselves as possible (and that mind must be Christ's mind), then we must devote ourselves with the vision and the generosity of Christ and of St. Paul to uniting those that have most in common with us. This is what St. Paul did in the case of the Jews: “For it (the Gospel) is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth, to the Jew first, and to the Greek” (Romans i, 16). After that comes the missionary work. I do not mean to disparage missionary work, it is essential if the Christian message is to be preached to the whole of mankind. But there is a hierarchy in God's election which we must respect if we desire to follow Christ's example and that of the great missionary apostle.

Nobody denies that the work for Christian Unity is fraught with enormous difficulties none the less real for their subtlety, and hampered by a dead weight of mutual prejudice. The attraction of missionary work is that there are far fewer delicate preliminaries to be waded through: one can start with a clean slate. If then the difficulties are greater, they demand a more definite will to succeed. But since the issue is an entirely supernatural one the work must be placed on a definitely supernatural level. Therefore the first need is for sincere, constant and fervent prayer, abnegation, and an immense love of God and our fellow-man. For these reasons the life of prayer of those who devote themselves to the work for Christian Unity must be centred upon, fed by and inspired by the Mass. For the Mass is but the renewal of the Redemption which is, in Christ's mind, essentially a humano-divine action to bring about Christian Unity: “That they be one. . . .” The Mass is the greatest prayer because it involves the whole of man and the whole of mankind. It is the most positive kind of abnegation because at Communion the individual lends his personality to the community, makes himself responsible for the human community to unite it to God in his personal assimilation to Christ. Needless to add that it is also the highest expression of human and

But if we desire to work fruitfully we must be utterly realistic and unite this realism with our vision. We must unite the other Christians to the centre of unity such as they are to-day ; guide and fulfil their desire for this unity, never expressed with more genuine accents than in our days, on lines which they understand. The movement for union with Rome has in the last generation entered upon a new and more promising phase. This movement has become the deepest expression of that general desire for a higher realization of the human community which is at the heart of the unrest of our times.

II.

The simple fact that the desire for union with Rome pervades all the great centres where Christian civilization has penetrated is perhaps known to most of us. Where this desire arose from, and why it should spread like fire in our times is perhaps less clearly realized. His Holiness Pius XI has pointed it out, though, with great perspicacity. In his Encyclical *Mortalium Animos* in which Catholics are rightly warned off superficial and harmful compromises on truth, he said : "*In these our times we have seen grow up a greater desire, perhaps, than has ever possessed the hearts of men, of strengthening that tie of brotherhood, which, in virtue of our one and the same origin and nature binds us together and makes us one, and of giving it practical expression for the common good of human society.* The nations do not yet enjoy the gifts of peace ; nay, old and new discords break out into civil and international conflicts. Moreover, there are many disagreements affecting the quietude and prosperity of peoples which cannot be settled without the harmonious cooperation of the governments of states. It is therefore easy to understand, *particularly since none now deny the oneness of the human race, why there is a widespread desire that the different nations, impregnated by this universal brotherhood, should cleave more and more closely together.*"

In other words, the Pope sees the origin of the world-wide movement towards Christian Unity in the new consciousness of our common nature and our common origin. Hence, too, the stress laid by the reigning Pontiff, on collaboration with those who share with us in the belief in one God and the love of one God.¹ We cannot overestimate the importance of this revolution in man's mind. The time of clans, tribes and absolutized nations has passed. Wherever were

¹See the remarks uttered by His Grace the Apostolic Delegate in St. Chad's Cathedral, Birmingham, and published by *The Tablet* of July 5th, 1941.

the caves from which our ancestors emerged towards the light of civilization, however different the cultures of the various nations, all men are now united, not only by common nature and origin—things easy to forget—but by the blunt fact of a cosmopolitan civilization. Even where nations glory in their selfish ambitions they think in terms of world-domination, of new world-orders. And a new world-order there will be, a new phase in human history, the phase of a literally world-embracing human community. Individualism has served its time. Communal life, corporate life in a great organic society will come out of the present crisis. And since man is essentially made for God, is essentially a religious being, it is only natural that in the very centre of this urge towards the greatest realization in history of the unity of mankind, there should move this still pathetic, yet promising effort for Christian Unity.

III.

If, then, our approach to non-Catholic Christians is to be a realistic one we must take our stand on the common issue. The perspective of the work for Christian Unity must be the perspective of the modern man, both Catholic and non-Catholic; it is the perspective of a unified mankind, living in an organic society, which doubtless does not yet exist but which is our future, indicated by historical evolution. This perspective finds its Christian expression in the theology and philosophy of the Mystical Body. This doctrine is not new, it is as old as the Gospel, St. Paul and St. John. But, though always implicitly present in the life of the Church, we believe that its full realization could not come about until mankind became first of all conscious of its universal unity, based upon our common origin and nature. This phase is opening up before our eyes, and we have to widen and deepen what we already possess in our Catholic heritage by the constant application of the teaching of the Mystical Body to all of it, explicitly this time¹. This is not done by adding a social paragraph to every chapter of existing scholastic manuals; it is a re-valuation which implies a re-valuation of our whole anthropology (practically wholly constructed on an individualistic basis), and consequently a re-valuation of psychology, and all that man thinks and does and loves. With this re-valuing of all our material we must build up a new and wider synthesis (however much the word may be disliked). This basic consideration of the unity of

¹ We may refer to the great book of Henri de Lubac, S.J., *Catholicisme : les aspects sociaux du dogme*, Paris, 1938.

mankind at the start of all our work will lead on to an immense labour of integration. Our mentality has suffered badly from the Reformation. Our theology has become too static. On reading a manual on the Mystery of the Blessed Trinity, one has the impression that there is not much left of the mystery at all. Our theology gives the impression of being out of touch with concrete life, of being conditioned by apologetics and becoming almost sectarian. The dogmas do not seem to be the inspiring openings of new issues as the Holy Spirit means them to be but final clauses which merely bar us from error and ignorance; the indefinitely repeated formulation of them in terms borrowed from the a-religious Aristotle seems to have the effect of preventing us from living into them, from exploring these helps given by the Church in a constructive way. Is not this perhaps the reason why so many of our spiritual books are so far removed from the Old and New Testament and from the sound tradition of Latin and Greek Fathers and concentrate on psychological and abstract niceties which are unavoidably subjective?

Why did we abandon the path of a patristic theology which St. Thomas had opened up in his masterly way? In the *Summa* there are plenty of patristic texts and a few syllogisms; in our manuals there are few patristic texts—which serve mainly as pious illustrations—and as many syllogisms as possible.

What the work of Christian Unity demands is the integration of our vision and of our reality not only in theory but in concrete fact. Books are not enough, they must find their inspiration and best defence in concrete example. This rule of silent deepening and constructing is a monks' rôle, as it was in the time of St. Benedict.

IV.

If this work of integration, of re-modelling our mentality on "Christian" lines, in the full meaning of that term, had to be created out of nothing it would be impossible. Nor can it be done by patching systems together. There is, however, another way. We can start from the very centre of the Church's life, there where She is most "integrally" Herself: at the Mass. If the Mass is the renewal, in a sacramental way, of the whole *Opus Redemptionis*, it will furnish us with a concrete fact, which contains all we desire to say; in it we can live out first what we may try to study and apply afterwards. A *living* fact, it will prevent us from enclosing our vision in a closed system. A *living* fact, it will with the help of God prevent us from separating dogma from morals,

theory from practice. A Christian integration can only come about by a re-valuation of all the values of life according to the Christus Totus of St. Augustine. And He is found, in concrete, acting reality, in the Holy Mass and the other Sacraments, and the rest of the Church's worship. The Mass is the perfect example of "integral" prayer, the prayer of Christ with His redeemed mankind. The Mass is the source of "integral" action, involving both God and the human community. The Mass is an immediate and concrete subject of study if we wish to work out the conception of a truly organic society in which community and person are integrated as Christ wanted them to be integrated. Did He not perfectly integrate Person and community when He died on the Cross and rose again?

Based on the Mass, inspired by the Mass in life, action, study, prayer and contemplation, the work for Christian Unity must result, simultaneously, in deeper unity among the Catholics, deeper unity and reconciliation of our separated brethren with the visible centre of the Church's visible Unity, deeper unity among men at large. It will inaugurate the reign of love which is the only reign which can call itself truly Christian.

If a community were founded where such work could be done and lived on these lines, and if this community became a centre of contact with our separated brethren who could come, see, study and pray in the cause of Christian Unity, there would be a chance of finding out possibilities without compromise, of understanding without controversy, of making the Church not merely feared and respected but loved. That such work would entail widespread contacts, gathering of innumerable documents, careful analysis, constant contact with Rome, beyond the requirements of a truly corporate, if possible self-supporting community, is obvious. Moreover, the formation of a fully Christian mentality, first of all by living out the Mass, then by constant pondering over the Bible, and great docility towards the teaching of the Latin and Greek Fathers, all this requires a unity of purpose which only a community living for that purpose could provide.

This is an obviously inadequate statement. Many will overlook points which, though mentioned only *en passant*, are all-important for a work of integration. But such are the limits of human speech. May I not have betrayed what I firmly believe is the greatest ideal answering the most urgent need of our days.

DOM THEODORE WESSELING.

ESSAYS TOWARDS THE ŒCUMENICAL METHOD¹

I. MISSIONS AND REUNION.

DR. N. ZERNOV voiced one of the most positive and constructive œcumenicist declarations when he affirmed: "What then are those steps so urgently needed in which we can secure a more rapid advance?"

In the light of the Fellowship's² experience the answer to this question is: the most important thing is the adoption of the same attitude to reunion work as is now commonly held in regard to the missionary activities of the Church.

"Work for reunion still suffers from a widespread and most misleading conviction that it should be the task of the Church in general and requires no special organisation and no allocation of men and money. There was a time when missionary work in England was handicapped by the same misunderstanding . . . no progress in that field was made until missionary societies had been founded to collect money to send missionaries abroad who should devote their whole life to this cause.

"It would be ridiculous to suggest that missionary work can succeed without being continually supported and financed by the Church, but, in regard to reunion, the same assumption, though equally absurd, is taken for granted. *The time has at last come when the similarity between the two tasks must be realised. . . .*

"No progress can be expected until the Churches put aside well qualified and properly trained men for the work of reunion, men who can be called missionaries of Unity. At present only the Roman Catholic Church has adopted this method, but unfortunately the value of her efforts is often undermined by the proselytising tendency which usually accompanies her work for reunion."³ In just the same way the Orthodox contribution to œcumenicism is so often stultified by her xenophobe "proselytism" complex; a phobia amounting to the Protestant horror of "persecution."

The scheme Dr. Zernov has here outlined could hardly fail to prove an eventual catholicon if implemented in its full implication. One is reminded of a recent congress of Catholic Orientalists who recommended, as a touchstone to eirenic *bona fides*, that Eastern-Catholic missionaries go forth

¹ The author of this article is an Orthodox.—EDITOR.

² The Fellowship of SS. Alban and Sergius.

³ *Sobornost'*, December 1939, p. 14. (Italics mine).

to the Far East to demonstrate that the Holy See really honours the Eastern liturgy as an integral ethos of her own, and does not merely use it as a vehicle of proselytism in the Christian East.¹

To return to Dr. Zernov's programme. Despite the record of the Church of czarist days in converting Asiatic Russia; despite all that can be claimed for internal missions and work in the Near East²—not forgetting the Japanese Orthodox Church, which now may assume a new significance in view of the recent march of events; despite Dr. Zernov's own protests to the contrary³, the Apostolic Orthodox Eastern Church has long had no missionary interest or organization that can be compared with the work in this category performed by even the Salvation Army or the more obscure and impoverished sects of Scandinavia. The present writer recently took up the question in more detail.⁴ Sufficient to say, as most tolerant and well-informed Western Christians allow, for many generations Eastern Christendom has been the prisoner of Islam and has had no opportunity to do more than to survive. But the fact remains that this defensive psychology has produced a phobia of proselytism (in any form) which is as conspicuous a contrast between Orthodox orientation and that of any Christian Westerner *per contra*.

Before the writer at the moment lies a copy of *Svenska Kyrkans Missionstiding*, No. 5 den 1 mars, 1940, p. 45, 46. After a survey of their evangelization in Asia comes the account of their work in the Balkans in the interests of Biblical propaganda: "*Bibeln på folkspråket är mycket litet spridd: 'Vi serber äro icke ett bibelläsande folk, vi äro icke protestanter utan pravoslavler,' heter det ofta.*"⁵ Yes, emphatically, it is high time for the Orthodox to adopt the same attitude to foreign missions as do the Western Christians. For, from the Sovereign Pontiff in St. Peter's to the preacher in the local

¹ *Eastern Churches Quarterly*, January, 1938.

The present writer understands that H.E. Cardinal Tisserant is not only an experienced Eastern liturgiologist but also an Orientalist of no mean repute, an authority on Mongolian Uigur MSS., etc. Could not the authorities follow his example and apply something of such oriental *Bildung* in S. India, for example, where Catholicism is represented by the tedious and hackneyed cults of a paternal St. Joseph, St. Thérèse of Lisieux, St. Anthony of Padua, the Sacred Heart, κ.τ.λ.

² Vide *Missionarismul Crestin Intre Mahomedani in Oriental Apropriat*, by Archimandrite Antim Nica Balti, reviewed in the *Eastern Churches Quarterly*, July 1940, p. 147-150.

³ Vide *Sobornost'*, March 1937, p. 26, and March 1939, p. 14.

⁴ Vide "Quo vadis Ecclesia?" *Star of the East*, October 1940, p. 6-11.

⁵ "The Bible is very little distributed in the people's language. 'We Serbs are not a Bible-reading folk, we are not protestants but pravoslavni' t is often said."

Bethel, Western Christendom proclaims one eschatological κήρυγμα. And that finds its inspiration in the otherwise¹ distinctly Jewish and national context of St. Matthew xxiv, 14 : "And this Evangelion of the Dominion shall be preached-as-κήρυγμα in the whole œcumenical world for a testimony unto all nations—and then shall the end come." All else is only a palliative for world disintegration ; there is no other short cut to the advent and epiphany of the Reign of God and a theocratic *Zukunftskirche*.

It is easy to belittle and pour scorn on Western proselytism. It is only too true that an Orthodox missionary in India, gazing about him, may on occasions lament : "The Westerners condemn us for our jealousies at the Holy Places of Jerusalem ; but see how they themselves scramble for neophytes and poach from their rivals !" The counsel of the Patriarch Damianos of Jerusalem is a catholicon :—Islam will only accept the Christos, when we who call ourselves His followers show forth Christos in our lives.

The corollary to the failure of world evangelism is apostasy from œcumenicity. Reunion is the salve, disunion the poison. But it is not enough for Orthodoxy in "splendid isolation" to give good advice to the West. In fact, the obvious shortcomings of Western evangelization may be as much due to the fact that Orthodoxy has no missionary witness or ambition, as that Westernism has a surfeit of misdirected enthusiasm for that cause.

The realistic recognition by Dr. Zernov of the financial aspect of maintaining a permanent œcumenical body of "missionaries of Unity" will be obvious to those who know the Christian East. From the wigwams of the frozen north to the kraals of the Indian jungle economic disability has long stultified the activity of the Eastern Churches. This is as characteristic a contrast between the condition, methods and organization of orientals and that of *any* Western Church, as is the absence of missionaries. Bankruptcy is obviously one very present reason for failure to answer the missionary call. But it is further a vicious circle, depressing and harassing the Eastern votary, and leading to that "inferiority complex" in which he cannot, or will not, assert himself outside his purely defensive *milieu*. This is not the "holy poverty" of St. Francis of Assisi, nor St. Sergie of Radonezh, for it is a demoralizing, disintegrating agent, not a creative spur. Yet none can deny that Orthodoxy has stamina—all that

¹ The Dominical command to the Apostolic Church : "Go ye . . . and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them . . ." *ibid.*, xxviii, 19, will also be recalled in this Matthaean context.

we call by the untranslatable Finnish term *sisu*, "morale, mettle, endurance, staying-power." And by this *sisu*, against overwhelming odds of persecution, Orthodoxy has survived and endured down till to-day's "troublous times."¹

II. THE QUEST FOR AN ŒCUMENICAL METHOD : SOBÓRNOST' OR EIRENIC-"CHURCHLINESS" ?

"No progress can be expected till the Churches put aside well qualified and properly trained men for the work for reunion, men who can be called missionaries of Unity," said Dr. N. Zernov. Dom Clement Lialine's scholarly and Catholic "Eirenic Method" is at once brought to mind. For the latter advocated an austere aristocracy of specialist œcumenicists . . . "the building up of an eirenic élite such as the more intelligent workers for reunion have always desired." He gave approval to conciliatory and assimilative principles which attain—or surpass—some of the best and soberest meanings of the elusive and enigmatic *Sobórnost'*.

"... the eirenic theologian armed with whatever weapons the historical and philological methods can give him for the full understanding of human realities will endeavour to assimilate all the true culture, all the growth in refinement which according to Berdyaev the human soul has experienced since the Renaissance, in order to be able to allow for those psychological 'imponderables' which are only too ponderable in their effects on œcumenicism."²

Quoting J. Doellinger's *The Reunion of the Churches*, p. 33, Dom Clement reminds us: "Above all the union of the churches will only become a possibility given a high level of intellectual culture, combined with intelligence and religious zeal."

Important, and not altogether irrelevant advice (to the subject we are now venturing to consider) was given by another Roman Catholic œcumenicist who was present at a High Leigh conference of the Fellowship of SS. Alban and Sergius in the summer of 1939: "The work of the Fellowship—may we say this in all friendliness?—ought perhaps

¹ This is a biblical phrase originally (Daniel ix, 25), and not "to use a Russian phrase" merely—as Dr. W. R. Inge supposed *à propos* Nero-nianism, reviewing *The Founding of the Church Universal* by Hans Lietzmann. How significant that so characteristic a Western thinker should recall it primarily in a Russian historical context, and then refer it back to "excenturiations raised to the purple . . . with the mental processes of a sergeant-major."

² *Eastern Churches Quarterly*, Vol. III, No. 7 (July 1939), etc.

to concentrate *less on propaganda*¹ than hitherto, *and more on research*; ought not the Orthodox members, in order to disentangle themselves from the lure of 'non-Roman Catholicism' . . . rely upon and bring out more of the living tradition (not merely a liturgical tradition) of their Church."²

It seems to the present writer that in the Eirenic Method we may conceivably have a Western Orthodox κήρυγμα which could prove complementary and corrective to the Slavonian *Sobornost*'. In his own mind he has been groping to explore some œcumenical method which—for want of a better name, and not without an etymologist's pedantic and esoteric motives³—might be designated *ek-klisiasticity*, or a selective "Churchliness" distinct from mere "ecclesiasticism," which has colloquially degenerated into almost a synonym for "clericalism." Dom Clement, or his translator, employs a phrase, "The *ecclésiification* of every level of life, leaving none secular in character . . . for example the 'free theocracy' of Soloviev."⁴ Such Christian anthropology, or *nouveau moyen age*, or *ecclésiification* would represent a category to be considered at a subsequent stage of this *ek-klisiastical* scheme. Dom Clement Lialine further suggests *en passant* "as indicating an eminently eirenic subject . . . *apostolicity* the traditional measure of *catholicity* and *unity* in the Church" instead of Khomiakov's *Sobornost*'.⁵ But at that point the pursuit of *ek-klisiasticity* follows up a different line.

Dom C. Lialine himself provides us with the clue when he observes of the eirenist: "he will not act as though the religious communion to which he belongs and which he believes to be true was born in the sixteenth century or in the eleventh or sixth; for him, it will originate in the essential plenitude, traditional and charismatic, of Pentecost; it will go back in its beginnings to the creation of the first man, and yet further, to the eternal divine idea of humanity" (*ibid.*). Exactly: yet that is not apostolicity, but ἡ Ἐκκλησία. As Rev. Frederick C. Grant (Union Theological Seminary,

¹ Subject, of course, to *propagation*, Bergson's (and D.C.L.'s) "noble work of popularization which . . . permits the averagely cultured mind to assimilate it in its broad lines." That is the rôle of κήρυγμα, which we owe to the research of Prof. Dodd.

² L.M. *Irenikon*=*Sobornost*', May 1940, p. 16-20 (italics mine). Cf. the *leitmotif* of the Athens Conference of 1936 was a purging of Orthodoxy from Western accretions and a return to (? exclusively Hellenistic) patristic origins.

³ It will not be thought necessary, in a purely ecclesiastical discussion, to give technical etymological justification for or against etacism, itacism, etc.

⁴ *E.C.Q.*, October 1939, p. 447.

⁵ *E.C.Q.*, July 1939, p. 408.

New York) observes:—" 'The church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth' (1 Tim. iii, 15) . . . it reflects a mystical, 'supernaturalistic' view of the church; it presupposes an antiquity which goes back to the beginning of the world—is it not the *ecclesia* of God the Creator? It assumes an authority on the part of the Church, for the safeguarding and accurate statement of truth, which anticipates the Byzantine Councils and Trent."¹ True Tertullian, at first glance, does not follow this sequence: "*Ecclesia ab apostolis, apostoli a Christo, Christus a Deo*" (De praescr. 37). But "*Ecclesia ab apostolis*" is surely relative; *die Urkirche* was and is from the beginning and in the beginning.

A problem is well known, ἑκκλησία only three times in the Gospels (St. Matth. xvi, 18; xviii, 17. bis). And so its Dominical institution has been questioned by the heterodox. "*Ecclesia ab apostolis*"—yes, but therefore not "*a Christo*." We need not reiterate how ἑκκλησία is the equivalent for the Hebrew *qābāl* and the Old Testament Church. "The term *ekklesia*, as applied to Christians, first appears in St. Paul's writings, but it is obvious that he is merely using a term of Jewish origin in this particular application which has become the conventional designation of the Christian community by the time of the first letter of his which we possess, written about the middle of the first century and about twenty years after our Lord's death."²

In the Septuagint version of Psalm lxxxix, 5-7, may be discerned a veritable proof-text for Orthodox *ek-klesiasticity*, proclaimed by all the force of Hebrew parallelism and paradigm:—"The heavens shall declare Thy wonders θαυμάσια, O Lord, and Thy Truth ἀλήθειαν in the Church of the Saints, ἐν ἑκκλησίᾳ ἁγίων . . ." God is glorified ἐνδοξαζόμενος in the council of the saints, ἐν βουλῇ ἁγίων.

(i) The *thaumastic* as extension and exposition of the primal, naïf numinous (*cf.* the original *religio* of the primitive, unsophisticated Latium). The Greek sense of θαυμαστός as the principle of active philosophy.—The distinction of *thaumastic* and *charismatic*; (θαυμαστός and χάρις, a mutual *Urform* as "wondrous, excellent, charm-ing, grace-full. . ." Of θαυμαστός Fr. S. N. Bulgakov writes: "This wonder before the divine mysteries which are celebrated in the Church, is also the principle of active theology, both theoretical and practical."³

¹ "The Nature of the Church," Part I, "Historical Origins." *Anglican Theological Review*, Vol. XXI, July 1939, No. 3, p. 190.

² *Ibid.*, p. 158, *The Church in the New Testament*, by Rev. Joseph Buchanan Bernardin, p. 161.

³ *The Orthodox Church*, p. 84.

(ii) The thesis ; divine 'αλήθεια 'εν 'εκκλησίᾳ 'αγίων.

(iii) 'εν-δοξαζόμενος, cf. 'Ορθο-δοξία in its pristine doxological sense, which is no debtor to the Slavonian translation *Pravoslavie*. Despite, or because of its etymological *Urform* (in δοκέω), 'Ορθοδοξία is the refutation of all *dokē*-etist error. Cf. Dom Gregory Dix, on "Dogma": — "It seems at first sight peculiar that the word 'dogma,' coming from the root δοκ- = 'to seem' (not from δα = 'to teach'), and which means originally a strictly human speculative opinion, should end by meaning a divinely-given and assured truth."¹ That doxological, thaumaturgic, givenness, *ab extra*, and the subjective "dogmatic-orthodox" response to such "shock of the Eternal in the temporal" is epitomized in the Lukan Evangelion ii, 14: "Δόξα! to God in the highest, and on earth εἰρήνη 'εν 'ανθρώποις εὐδοκίας (εὐδοκία)."

(iv) 'ενδοξαζόμενος 'εν βουλῇ ἁγίων, cf. the Hellenic phrase ἔδοξε τῇ βουλῇ, τῷ δήμῳ = "it was decreed or enacted." βουλή, *per se*, may allow of some sense of *soborny* democratic *concilium* (the assembly of 500 at Athens; "Communion of the Saints" is what it means in our former context.

Without pursuing this lexical inquiry into more ramifications, the present writer would not venture outside his own domain to further analysis of this data, where it impinges on historical and philosophical speculation beyond his scope for deduction. Yet it seems evident that while this Septuagint extract could be interpreted as the *Cosmic Sobór*² of the Slavonians, it could hardly represent a cosmic *Sobórnost'*.

We now proceed to a paradigm from Joel ii, 15, 16:—(Σαλπίζατε σάλπιγγι 'εν Σιών, ἀγιάσατε νηστείαν.) κηρύξατε θεραπείαν, συναγάγετε λαόν, ἀγιάσατε 'εκκλησίαν, 'εκλέξασθε πρεσβυτέρους, συναγάγετε νήπια. We will likewise suspend detailed and technical exegesis of this passage, and refrain from

¹ *Sobornost'*, September 1939, p. 27.

² Besides *Sobór* in the Old Church Slavonic as "basilica," "congregation," "church assembly," etc., there are modern political variations of the same "collective-assembling" idea—the Bulgarian Parliament is the *Sobranie*, the Croat Diet the *Sabor*, and of course *soviet*—which has some interesting *nuances* as "council, concord, conciliar deliberation."

What is really wanted is a competent lexicographical analysis, a *Wörterbuch* symposium by Slavists and Hellenists, to correlate the former *soborny* vocabulary with 'εκκλησία, 'εκκλησιάζω, σύγκλητοι, βουλή κ.τ.λ. in their pure Hellenic *milieu*. Much valuable research has already been done by scholars into the significance of πόλις. Incidentally the latter is collateral to the understanding of *ek-klesiasticity* and *Sobórnost'*. Nor can the more conventional western theologians proceed to any conspectus of such "obvious" themes as the Reign or City of God, unless they take account of all these factors in Œcumenical, theandric, theocracy.

a synopsis of when the O.T. *Urkirche* was designated ἑκκλησία and when συναγωγή. However, in view of the important implications of the research—from Congregationalist premisses—which my friend and συνεργὸς ἐν Χριστῷ, Dr. H. C. Lefever¹ has transmitted; it will be necessary to underline the *nuance* in the above LXX quotation:—

(i) ἐκ-λέξασθε πρεσβυτέρους is selective, an “elect or eclectic *presbytery*,” as concomitant to the hallowed *Ek-klesia*. Whereas: The Laity are merely collective, *con-gregational*.

(ii) συν-αγάγετε λαόν, *i.e.* the laity in aggregate [*grex-aggregare*]. συν-αγάγετε νήπια, *i.e.* the babes of Cor. A. iii, 1-2 ὡς νηπίοις ἐν χριστῷ, whom the Apostle could feed only with milk and not meat.

We pass on to the contention that “*Ecclesia ab apostolis*” were remote: for 1 Tim. iii, 15, “certainly is not Paul’s language—he called the church ‘the Body of Christ’”: F. C. Grant.² Closer attention to Pauline use of the term ἑκκλησία, and to his contemporary *Zeitgeist*, does not presuppose any such conclusion. Already the importance of the ἑκκλησία was coming more and more to the fore in the new churchly experience of the Christians as Σῶμα Χριστοῦ. From the ideal of the Church as fellowship in the Body of Christ, it was inevitable to think of Church as a living, organic, *soborny*, *con-gregation*: συναγωγή: a corporate unit in the fellowship (ἀγάπη) of democratic-eirenic³ assembly. The *Didachy* prays “. . . gather the Church together from the four winds into Thy Dominion. . . .” (commentary: *to make it an œcumenically-integral Church, a Zukunftskirche*).

Ἐκκλησία was not only implicit in all the O.T. prophetic, and later Messianic-Christoic κήρυγμα, it was—as we have noted—literally much in evidence in the pages of the B.C. LXX.; to which the early Christians *more and more* resorted as they *diverged from Semitic Judaism* and from the SYNAGOGUE.

¹ *Lay Celebration of the Lord's Supper*: “A Congregationalist Point of View.” By H. C. Lefever, B.D., Ph.D., Principal Union School of Divinity, Trivandrum, S. India. C.L.S., Madras, 1940.

A piquant and scholarly apologia for the theory of an indiscriminate priesthood of all the laity in the *Urkirche*. I cannot claim to have given his arguments the attention they deserve, within the range of this paper—but that was hardly its purpose. Yet I must acknowledge that my trend of thought herein owes much to the promptings of his eloquent publication.

² *Ibid.*, note 1, p. 12.

³ It is surely remarkable that *Agapē* has become a watchword of Christian “charity,” but that *Eiriny* has been so far overlooked, although it was so prominent in the N.T. and almost every Pauline greeting and admonition (χαρίς ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη κ.τ.λ.) I have not attempted to define or correlate the rôle of *Eiriny* with *Ek-klesia* at this stage. Yet the Sophiologist should be reminded that St. Constantine dedicated a church to ‘*Aghia Eiriny*’ as well as ‘*Aghia Sofia*.’

The primal ἑκκλησία linked the new Christian congregation with the historic past of Israel. And so it assumed its primordial connotation, an *Urkirche*. For as the new Christian consistory came to realize that the Temple had lapsed into schism and apostasy, they claimed themselves to be the true *Urkirche*. In another sense they spoke of themselves as a separate *kenishtâ*, translated ἑκ-κλησία (*i.e.* "assembly-out"), in contrast to the Jewish συναγωγή or "assembly-together, thrown together"—about which a fluent Hellenist could have made puns, since it conveyed some sense of "narrowing, contracting" and even "forming provocative factions for fighting" (*cf. grex aggress-ion; con-gregation contention*). It is important to realize the distinction between the "altogether-ness" of *Sobórnost'*, con-gregation, con-glomeration, συναγωγή κ.τ.λ. and the quite different claim of the *Urkirche* to be *elect* (ἑκ-λεκτός¹ selected, chosen *out*) as the Righteous Remnant of old. To be "churchly" was to be ἑκ-κλητος² called *out* as judge, selected to arbitrate. "Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus" is tautology, as Fr. Florovsky has pointed out.

"*Ecclesia a Christo*"? Decidedly. Christos alone was ὁ Ἐκλεκτός—"If this is the Christos of God, ὁ Ἐκλεκτός . . . if Thou art the King of the Jews, save Thyself!" (St. Luke xxiii, 35, 37). Yes, HE is the Elect, therefore He will not save Himself. And so the one Strong Man of all history triumphed, the Incarnation of the Reign of God; the Second Adam, the Head of His Body the Church. Ἰδε, ὁ ἄνθρωπος!—Ἰδε, ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑμῶν!

The corporate ideals of Son of Man (οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ³ of LXX.), Suffering Isaianic Servant, Righteous Remnant, Dominion of God, *all* attain *personal* realization ἐν χριστῷ at Golgotha. But from the Empty Tomb they emerge again as corporate, "*Corpus Christi*" transfigured. Hence: "*Ecclesia ab apostolis*." Here we must agree with Dom Clement Lialine, that not *Sobórnost'* but *apostolicity* is the criterion of "Churchliness." For the *ek-klisiastical* is selective, whereas *Sobórnost'* seems vaguely collective. Hence *ek-klisiasticity* recognizes the factor of "building up of an eirenic élite," an aristo-cracy. This iconic *Bildung* quite naturally takes account of culture, integral "*ecclésification* of every level of life, leaving none secular in character." For *Ekklesia* is not a mere cultus, but the Reign

¹ ἐκλέγω.

² ἐκκαλέω *cf. evocatus*, "vocation." (St. Matth. xxii, 14; *cf. Apoc. xvii, 14*.) N.B. also the *sobornny* sense of ἑκκλησιάζω—"to debate or sit in assembly" *Sobórnost'* *per se* need not be denied. But it might be possible to suggest that it should properly occupy a subordinate rôle, as some kind of relative interim's-ethic.

³ *i.e.* for "Children of Israel."

of God Who is, in the Nicene phrase, Παντοκράτωρ, Universal Emperor.

Here certain "non-Roman Catholic" readers may object that this is to fall into the common error of forgetting the Dominion of God, and taking the first step toward marching forward to the ecclesiastical state. In the space at one's disposal it is not possible to take up these nice points of the Reign of God and the theocratic rôle.

Certainly *ek-klesiasticity* is elect, authoritative, and so hierarchic to a sense that *Sobórnost'* is not. The *ek-klesiastic* is nearer Konstantin Leontiev and Fr. Florovsky than Khomiakov and Fr. Bulgakov. (The present writer understands that Fr. Bulgakov's exposition of *Sobórnost'* in relationship to œcumenicity created some "theological shocks"—as Dom Clement would say—at the Athens Conference of Orthodox Theologians in 1936.)

But *Ekklesia* is not merely authoritarian, still less "totalitarian"¹—indeed, there may be a sense in which only a vague "altogetherness" of *Sobórnost'* could arrive at the latter, as when the *Sóbor* became apostatized into the *soviet*.

For ἑκκλησία had other tremendous significance in the vocabulary of classical Hellas. And surely this *nuance*, collateral with LXX terminology, was not lost on the Pauline age who understood Church as Σῶμα Χριστοῦ. In ancient Athens ἑκκλησία referred to the democratic *elected* parliament called out by special κήρυγμα (here, in this *political* sense meaning by public summons or proclamation by crier of the City State). This again gives us a very intriguing cross reference, which we cannot pursue now, to the πόλις, the true fatherland; the πολίτευμα, the colony or second home; and Moffatt's felicity "a colony of Heaven"—Philp. iii, 20. And hence a fresh criterion for surveying the relationship of St. Augustine's *Civitas Dei*, the Dominion of God, and the Cosmo-polis in its *ek-klesiastical* context.²

There is room for a *sobórnost'* in such an assembly, and like the Slavonian phrase, also for the *nuance* of the verb from the same origin:—"to debate or sit in assembly." But though *Ekklesia* is *soborny*, She is also eclectic (*ek-lektikos*) (rather in the Middle sense of ἑκ-λέγω "to choose out for oneself"—i.e. for Herself). For this selective rôle, for this speeding on to the *Zukunftskirche*, for this "ecclesiastification of every level of life, leaving none secular in character," the eirenic aristocracy,

¹ Save as integral, reintegrated; *Totus Christus—Ecce Homo!* II. *Adam=Corpus Christi*.

² See also *Die Polis in Kirche und Welt*. By K. L. Schmidt, Zollikon, Zürich, 1939. Cf. Dr. Friedrich Heiler's *Das Gebet*, p. 305, 325-327.

the élite are necessary ; as a prophetic remnant ἑκ-κλητος, called out by the vocation of missionaries for œcumenicity. (The particular temptations and apostasies of and from that vocation, together with the dangers of ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται must be discussed on another occasion.)

There should be no rivalry between the two ecclesiologies, *sobórnost'* and *ek-klesiasticity*. The keystone is another term of immemorial ecclesiology, λειτουργία. Some men, learned in the Word, but—alas !—heterodox in premiss, have devoted no little study to demonstrating that in the LXX. and N.T. the use of “ to liturgize ” substantiates the theory of a promiscuous “ priesthood of all the laity ” (λαός κ.τ.λ.) in the *Urkirche*. This has undoubtedly given us a healthy “ theological shock,” and predisposed us to look more kindly on the claims of a *soborny* congregationalism. But the facts cannot be ignored that in the Old Testament the priesthood was *separated* and selected from the laity—as the corporate Church as a whole was *separated* and selected from all the nations of the earth (e.g., LXX. Joel ii, 15, 16 ; Deut. xviii, 5).

Let us, for instance, consider the paradigm of LXX. Isaias ch. lxi :—

(a) verse 1-2—St. Luke iv, 18-19, the prophecy of the evangelic *chrismatic-pneumatic* Σωτήρ Champion.

And as corollary :—

(b) *ibid.* lxi, 6 : “ But ye (*i.e.* the Righteous corporate-Remnant) shall be called κληθήσεσθε sacrificing-priests of the Lord, ἱερεῖς, and liturgists of God, λειτουργοὶ ΘΥ.”

(This should be expounded in conjunction with the *chrismatic-charismatic* rôle in O.T. and N.T., into which we cannot now digress.)

Collaterally in its Hellenic context an act of λειτουργία, although denoting a public duty to the democracy, was a service undertaken by only the aristocratic élite. In the same way the democratic legislative ἑκκλησία of Athens, convened by or through the crier κήρυξ, was probably also something of an elect bureaucracy. It would also be instructive to know if or how the citizens were initiated into the office of senator, and what was the exact significance of κήρυγμα in the course of political proceedings and in the constitution.

The present writer is, unfortunately, a *gauche* and anachronistic alien in classical Athens and its *hinterland*. For his interests have been centred on that Rômaic Ἑλληνιστί *milieu* which derived “ when Greek conquered Jew and Jew conquered Greek, and the world inherited the legacy of their struggle through Roman hands.”¹

¹ Mahaffy.

However, so experienced a "time traveller" as Dom Gregory Dix gives us news that might support the view of the Athenian ἑκκλησία suggested above. "Dr. Florovsky contended that the πόλις is a *less* 'organic' conception than that of the 'body,' inasmuch as a democracy is not hierarchically organised. But even a 'pure' democracy has 'organs' of government, and I take it that it is just the existence and constitutional functioning of such organs which in the Greek idea distinguished the πόλις from a δεσποτεία on the one hand and a κώμη on the other. I doubt if Dr. Florovsky has rightly grasped the notion of the πόλις. The Greeks were quite well aware that οὐ γίνεται πόλις ἐξ ὁμοίων. According to Aristotle (*Politics* iii, 5) its constitution may be monarchical, aristocratic, or democratic, or a combination of all these; but its government is always a πολιτεία, provided it be carried on "for the common advantage," and not for the selfish interests of the governors."¹

I speak under correction from Hellenic specialists, and as an intransigent Constantinopolitan "despotist." But would not any other more demo-cratic view of pre-Christian Greek politics be mere poetic, Byronic romanticism, the mirage of a Golden Age in a Utopian "Never-Never Land"?

It was from the context just quoted that Dom Gregory proceeded to the consideration of a *charismatic* Episcopate in its relationship to Dogma and the Mystical Body. But here we will merely conclude our quest:—"Ecclesia ab apostolis."

"Paulos, a slave of IHC. XPC. κλητὸς ἀπόστολος, called to be an apostle, separated ἁφωρισμένος unto the Evangelion of God. . . ." addresses his congregation; "κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ. Χριστοῦ. . . . κλητοῖς ἁγίοις." Rom. i, 1, 7.

Cor. i is in the same strain, except that it has the more emphatic "unto τῇ ἑκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇ οὐσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ" (2), *i.e.* not just "the house-chapel that is in Corinth"; demonstrating in what sense the faithful are κλητοῖς ἁγίοις. II Cor. i, 1 has the same "ecclesiastical" emphasis.

Tit. i, 1 adds "Paulos . . . ἀπόστολος . . . κατὰ πίστιν ἐκλεκτῶν Θεοῦ" . . . elect of God. . . .

. . . "And as they *liturgized* (λειτουργούντων) to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate Me Ἀφορίσατε δὴ μοι, Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them προσκέκλημαι" (Acts xiii, 2).

The supposed dilemma between evangelical κήρυγμα and "new presbyter but old priest writ large" is further resolved by such passages as Rom. xv, 16, where the Apostle claims

¹ *Sobornost'*, December 1939, p. 7.

“That I should be a liturgist λειτουργός¹ XY. ’ΙΥ. unto the Gentiles . . . ἱεουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ ΘΥ., that the προσφορά² of the Gentiles might be acceptable.” (Cf. LXX. Isaias lxi, 6 ; cf. Philp. ii, 17). “Yea, and if I am poured out as a libation σπένδομαι ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ upon the sacrifice and λειτουργίᾳ of your faith.” . . . The force of σπένδομαι is also eirenic, “to pour out the drink offering” is “to make peace, to make a treaty or covenant, to be at peace.” “For it was the good pleasure εὐδόκησε that (*in Christo*) should all the fulness dwell ; and through Him to reconcile again all things unto Himself, having made peace εἰρηνοποιήσας through the Blood of His Cross. . . . And you, being in time past alienated and enemies in your mind, in your evil works, yet now hath He reconciled (ye have been reconciled) in the Body of His Flesh through death, to present you holy and without blemish and unreprieveable before Him.” (Coloss. i, 19–22.)

VASSILY JAMES.

¹ εἰς τὸ εἰναίμε λειτουργὸν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ (Rom. xv. 16).

² *Prosfora*, i.e. the technical term for the Holy Bread in the Byzantine Liturgy.

THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

TO-DAY'S about 90,000 Orthodox Russians in the United States of America are the offspring of the missions of the Russian Church in former days. Missionary activities have always been rather small in the Orthodox Churches, but one has to make an exception for the Church of Russia. It is known that the Orthodox churches in Japan and China were originally evangelized by the Church of Russia. Alaska was discovered in 1741 by a Russian expedition ordered by Peter the Great and it was owned by Russia until 1867, when the U.S. government bought the whole territory for \$7,200,000.

Only a few decades after its discovery some eight monks of the famous Valaam-monastery in Lake Ladoga (bombed by the Russians during the Finnish-Russian war of 1939, when the monks had to leave it) settled down in Alaska. In 1794 the first Russian Orthodox church was built in the new country. The mission thrived. Baptisms were administered by the thousand. It is said that during the first two years 12,000 natives were baptized. A few years after their arrival a bishopric was established on the island of Kodiak (1799). The leader of the mission, Archimandrite Ioasaph, was consecrated first Orthodox bishop in the new world. He never took possession of his see, for on his way his ship was sunk in a storm.

A new era began when a seminarian of the Irkutsk Theological Seminary was ordained: Father John Veniaminoff landed in 1824, on the island of Unalashka, one of the Aleutian islands, where he remained for ten years. He learned the language, studied Aleutian grammar, translated the Divine Liturgy and the Catechism, visited other parts, in short, did all he could for the welfare of his mission. During a visit to Russia he was received by the Czar, Nicholas I (1840), and, as the authorities were interested in his work, he was appointed Bishop of Alaska and Kamchatka, under the name of Innocent. Bishop Innocent returned, continued his work, founded schools and even a seminary for the natives. In Sitka, one of the islands, he built his cathedral (1848.) This cathedral still stands.

Bishop Innocent later was made an archbishop and in 1867 he became Metropolitan of Moscow. In the same year, as already mentioned, Alaska became a U.S. territory, but Bishop Innocent took care that in the deed of sale provision was made for the rights of the Orthodox Church. The change of possession of the Alaska territory made it

possible to extend the mission field into a "north American mission." Indeed, in 1870, the first Russian chapel was opened in New York City. Curiously enough this first Russian chapel was served by an apostate R.C. priest Nicholas Berring. Two years later the See of Sitka was transferred to San Francisco (1872).

This year a book has been published by the Metropolitan Council of the Russian Orthodox Church in New York entitled *Yearbook 1941 of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church in America*. It furnishes many facts about present conditions. As a matter of fact, owing to the emigration from Europe during the last half of the nineteenth century the Russian Orthodox Church in America increased greatly in numbers. It is true that many of these emigrants from Europe, when they were living in the New World, lost their faith or no longer practised it, or were converted to the Latin part of the Catholic Church. From the other side, it is the unpardonable fault of the ecclesiastical authorities of the last century, that practically all Eastern *Catholics* left the Church and entered the Orthodox Church. A painful exchange of members indeed. The then bishops did not even know what an Eastern Catholic was like! When the first Eastern Catholic parish was organized in Minneapolis, the local Catholic Bishop refused to recognize the married priest, Fr. Toth. What Fr. Toth did was wrong, but understandable: he and his flock entered the Orthodox Church (1891).

The *Yearbook 1941* has been compiled by Dr. Basil M. Bensin (born and graduated in Russia) and is more or less confusing, as no systematic exposé is given. Nevertheless it is interesting to study and the following facts are drawn from different parts of it and put together.

ORGANISATION OF THE RUSSIAN CHURCH IN U.S.A.

The supreme organ of Church organisation is the *Sobor* or *General Church Convention*, born out of the difficulties which had arisen after World War I. Conditions abroad necessitated that the Russian Church in America declare her autonomy, naturally within the dogmatic, liturgical and canonical framework of the mother church in Russia. This autonomy was declared as early as 1919, when the General Church Convention met at Pittsburgh. Later Sobors were held in 1924, 1934 and 1937. The Sobor elects the Primate. Sometimes, as in the case of the present Metropolitan, Theophilus, the primate is elected by the Bishops' Council and afterwards approved by the Sobor.

The *Ruling Bishop* is the Primate, "Metropolitan of All America and Canada" and head of the "Russian Orthodox Greek-Catholic Church" in America (at present the Most Rev. Theophilus).

The *Bishops' Council*, assembled at the call of the Metropolitan for the consideration of current problems of the Church. At present there are two Archbishops, Tichon of Seattle and Western America; and Vitaly of Jersey City and Eastern America, besides the retired Archbishop Arseny in Tichon's monastery. There are also six Bishops: dioceses of Alaska, Canada, Chicago and Minneapolis, Pittsburgh and West Virginia, Detroit and Cleveland, Brooklyn.

The *Metropolitan Council*, a permanent executive organ elected by the Sobor and consisting of clergy and laymen, acting with the approval of the Metropolitan. At present this Metropolitan Council counts two Bishops—one of them the Metropolitan—six priests and five laymen.

STATISTICS.

The more important facts revealed by the official census¹ of 1906, 1916, 1926 and 1936 are here reproduced (taken from the *Yearbook*.)

		1906	1916	1926	1936
Church-edifices	46	164	194	218
Members	19,111	99,681	95,134	89,510
Parsonages	—	—	—	140
Sunday Schools	1	116	90	101
Pupils of Sunday Schools		75	6,739	5,770	4,293

¹ The Religious Census of 1926 and 1936, as given in the "Report of the Bureau of the Census," Department of Commerce of the U.S.A., gives the following details concerning the independent Eastern Churches in the United States:

	Churches.		Members.	
	1936	1926	1936	1926
Albanian Church	13	9	3,137	1,993
American Holy Orthodox Catholic Apostolic Eastern Church	4	—	1,420	—
Apostolic Episcopal Church	12	—	6,389	—
Bulgarian Orthodox Church	5	4	969	937
Greek Orthodox Church	241	153	189,368	119,495
Roumanian Orthodox Church	35	34	15,090	18,853
Russian Orthodox Church	229	199	89,510	95,134
Serbian Orthodox Church	27	17	20,020	13,775
Syrian Antiochian Orthodox Church	61	30	18,451	9,207
Ukrainian Orthodox Church of America	28	—	11,480	—
Assyrian Jacobite Apostolic Church	4	3	3,100	1,407
African Orthodox Church	13	13	1,952	1,568

It is interesting to see that there is a complete equilibrium between the male and female members, each about 50 per cent. The percentage for the members under 13 years is 25.3 per cent in the 1936 census. This percentage is quite good, but it is obvious that the number of pupils in the Sunday Schools has been decreasing enormously since 1916. Between 1916 and 1926 the decrease was about 1,000, but between 1926 and 1936 it was already about 1,500. Curiously enough there is no decrease in the Sunday School staffs, as a matter of fact the staffs are increasing: for the years 1916, etc. the numbers are 150, 152, 202.

There are at present, according to the above statistics, 218 churches. The list indicates that there are 229 churches as local organizations. The number of these local organizations (parishes) and of the church edifices has been increasing during the last thirty years. On the contrary the number of the members is decreasing (last decade, *e.g.* with - 5.9 per cent). This fact is of special importance, as after 1916—the year in which the statistical downfall begins—the crowds of Russian refugees came to America, especially in 1923 from Constantinople.

MONEY.

The average number of members per church is very low. In 1936 it was apparently no more than 391. Of course the costs are high under those circumstances. Curiously enough the burden per head is almost nothing, and even 47 of the 218 churches report to have “no debt.” The average value per church is to be taxed at about \$22,853. The total amount for the churches given in the statistics is \$4,936,350. Add to this the \$685,020 as the total value of 140 parsonages (only 135 are included).

Two remarks.

(1) “Churches” in these statistics are to be understood as organisations; in the statistics as taken from Dr. Bensin’s *Yearbook* by “churches” actual buildings are to be understood. This explains the difference in number. In the *Yearbook* itself the correct number of church organisations is given as well.

(2) The Syrian Antiochian Orthodox Church, named in this list is an offspring of the Russian Orthodox Church. This Russian Church has developed an enormous activity. Originally in 1895 a Syro-Arabian mission was set up, which developed in 1925 into an independent Syrian Antiochian Orthodox Church of America under the jurisdiction of the dissident Patriarch of Antioch, with the consent of the Russian metropolitan in U.S.A., Platon. From the statistics one may see the enormous development of this church. Details about it in Dr. Bensin’s *Yearbook*, p. 19.—J.H.

It is interesting to reproduce the expenditures for 1936 :—

Pastor's salaries	\$203,060
Other salaries	\$80,467
Repairs, improvements	\$72,697
Payment on church debt, excluding interest	\$64,195
Other current expenses, including interest	\$131,800
Local relief, Red Cross, etc.	\$9,436
Home Missions	\$2,991
Foreign Missions	\$425
General headquarters for distribution ..	\$5,010
All other purposes	\$21,272
Average expenditure per church .. .	\$2,617

The average expenditure per member—average 391 per church—is a very low amount, only about \$6.50!

Finally, it is interesting to note that 83.4 per cent of the members and 72.5 per cent of the church-edifices is to be found in urban territory.

METROPOLITAN THEOPHILUS.

At present the head of the Russian Orthodox Church in America is the Most Reverend Theophilus, who bears the title of "Archbishop of San Francisco, Metropolitan of All America and Canada." This title was for the first time bestowed in 1903 on Archbishop Tichon, who occupied the See from 1898 till 1907. This is the same Tichon who was Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia from 1917 till 1925 (died March 25th). Since Tichon the Archbishops of San Francisco keep the title, but reside in New York (Cathedral of Holy Virgin Protection, see below). The Metropolitan's secular name is Theodor Pashkovsky. He was ordained in 1899. When he was made Bishop of Chicago in 1934 he took the name of Theophilus. During a trip to Europe where he visited the late Patriarch Varnarva of Serbia, he established through Varnarva's help contact with the Russian refugee Church in different European countries.

CHIEF INSTITUTIONS.

Among the chief institutions of the Russian Church in the United States are :—

The Russian American Orthodox Messenger, official monthly organ of the Russian Church in America. Its present editor is the Dean of the New York cathedral, the Very Reverend Theophan M. Buketoff, graduate of the Odessa Seminary in Russia.

St. Vladimir's Theological Orthodox Seminary. In 1905 Archbishop Tichon founded a Seminary in place of the Missionary School in Minneapolis. Graduates from Russian academies were instructors. After World War I the seminary was transferred to New York. Because of financial difficulties it had to be closed in 1923, but in 1938, as a result of a decision of the Russian American Sobor in 1937, the seminary was reopened by Archbishop Theophilus in New York under the name of Saint Vladimir's Theological Seminary. The Archbishop himself is the president. The seminary has about five or six students.

St. Tichon's Monastery, founded in 1906 by the Reverend Hieromonk Arseny Chagovetz at South Canaan, Pennsylvania. In this state nearly all Russian activities are centred.

In 1935 Archbishop Theophilus appointed an *Educational Council*. By this council special school conventions were assembled in various districts, with its chief aim of maintaining religious education among the parishes.

Under the guidance of this Council *Sunday Schools* were organized. A textbook in Russian and English has been published by it.

The Russian youth were organized in 1926 in Pittsburgh. In 1927 the new organization was established as the "*Federated Russian Orthodox Clubs*," which grew rapidly.

Eight brotherhoods, whose statistics are printed in the *Year-book* 1941, page 76, from a report by Father Peter Kohanik at the Sobor of 1937. The largest brotherhood is the "Russian Brotherhood Organization of America" with 17,214 members in 264 societies. This brotherhood has a capital of \$1,646,920. This is the only brotherhood with more than a million. Another big organization is the "Russian Orthodox Mutual Aid Society" with 6,427 members in 219 societies and \$915,546. Moreover there are brotherhoods for women, etc. The eight brotherhoods together command a capital of \$4,360,141 (together they have 43,837 members in 1,084 societies).

Svit (i.e. The Light), Russian weekly paper, published every Thursday and founded in 1897 (not owned by the Church). This paper is published partly in Russian and partly in English, and is very well edited. The present Editor is the Very Reverend John Krashkevich. The paper is run by the Russian Orthodox Catholic Mutual Aid Society of U.S.A., an organization composed of 219 brotherhoods.

A property for a *Home for aged clergy*, and an *orphanage*, both to be built on a lot in the neighbourhood of St. Tichon's monastery, which has been already bought.

Several important churches. Because of litigation St. Nicholas' Cathedral Church in New York and its archiepiscopal residence were taken away from the owners. The American Episcopal Church (affiliated with the Anglican) offered the Russians the use of a portion of Trinity Parish Church in New York. This church was transformed into a Russian shaped cathedral and entitled *Cathedral of the Holy Virgin Protection*. It is situated in East Houston street, very easily accessible from all parts of New York, marvellously decorated and full of the true Russian spirit.¹

The Church of Christ the Saviour, famous, as it was the refugee church, after the Russian refugees in 1923 came from Constantinople to America.

The Orthodox and Anglican Fellowship, instituted in 1934, for providing contact between the Russian Orthodox and Episcopal (Anglican) Church in U.S.A. The Episcopal Church in U.S.A. is very "high-church" minded, but one gets the impression that clergy and people attach much more to exterioralism than their more catholic-minded fellow-Anglicans in England.

A number of committees for several aims, funds for different purposes, study-circles, etc.

Facts in this article were drawn from *Yearbook* 1941, the weekly *Svit*, private correspondence and experience during a journey through the United States.

Curacao, N.W.I.

DR. JOHN HARTOG.

¹ Curiously enough, within five minutes walk from this church one finds St. Michael's chapel, the chapel of the Russian Catholics. Father Andrew Rogosh, ex-pupil of the Russicum, Rome, is its chaplain aid and founder. The interior of an old chapel, no longer used, belonging to Old St. Patrick's, former Latin cathedral of New York (now New St. Patrick's at Fifth Avenue with horrible decorations, windows, etc., is the Latin Cathedral), was transformed into a chapel where Father Rogosh has his Russian centre. A small but fine choir was formed out of young zealous Catholics (mostly Latins), who work in a spirit of comradeship and catholic ideology. The Sunday-morning Liturgies at St. Michael's are a revelation in the New World. No other Oriental Catholic church in New York is worth mentioning, as they are all terribly Latinized in shape and spirit. Worst of all are the Maronite Church and the Ukrainian Church.

CHRONICLE OF EVENTS

WE think in the present state of affairs there is no point in giving an account of the strife and horrors or even the heroism that is the common lot of those dwelling in the Near or Middle East. Let us pray for them with an unconquerable faith in victory that the triumph of the *Christus Victor* may soon come. We will then but put on record a few documents that should be preserved and stress certain facts and tendencies that may indicate future events.

ROME—VATICAN RELIEF WORK.

In the latest edition of the *Vatican Yellow Book* (covering the year ending December 15th) there appears the following item of special interest :—"The Holy See also organized aid in territories afflicted by the war. The Bishops of France, Belgium, Luxemburg and Holland have received funds to relieve hardship. Similar action was carried on in Slovenia, Croatia, Serbia and Scandinavia. The Holy Father has watched with special anxiety over the fate of the Greek population; since August 1941, diplomatic negotiations have been afoot with a view to foodstuffs being delivered to the Greeks. The Apostolic Delegate in Athens received considerable funds for the purchase of food. . . ." (vid. *The Tablet*, February 21st, 1942).

YUGOSLAVIA.

On Sunday, November 30th, His Majesty King Peter of Yugoslavia, with General Simovic and other members of the Yugoslav Government, attended a *Te Deum* rendered in Westminster Cathedral for the Unity of Yugoslavs, after which His Eminence Cardinal Hinsley, Archbishop of Westminster, preached. (This is an extract):

"On this National Day of Yugoslavia, Your Majesty's presence here in the midst of your Serbian, Slovene and Croatian subjects proclaims to the world that the triple bond which unites your people shall not be broken, however much the violence and deceitful propaganda of the invaders may seek to divide your nation. We, the Catholics of this country, with our friends and with our allies from many countries, are gathered around this Altar to support the cause of Yugoslavia; we withstand in every way possible the forces which have attacked your freedom and independence. We offer our prayers, with and through the Victim and High Priest of our Altars, that the suffering members of the Yugoslav nation may be upheld in their

heroic spirit of defence, and that their cruel persecutors may not prevail. For your martyred nation and the many peoples at this moment tortured under the harrow of the barbarous conquerors, we express our deep, heartfelt sympathy. In the literal sense of that word, we have a fellow-feeling for them. Their agony is ours, because when one member of Christ's body suffers all the members suffer with it. We pray indeed for all those who suffer, whatever their race, their religion, or their nationality. . . .

"Your Majesty and dear Brethren: 'A triple cord is not easily broken.' All your subjects—Serbs, Croats and Slovenes—are united in a bond of loyalty to you and your Government. They are united in the determination to uphold the life and independence of Yugoslavia, and those who are exiles are resolved to return to their country in order to work together—Catholic and Orthodox—for its reconstruction. But they know that Christian moral principles—truth, justice, charity—can alone form the basis of real peace and secure happiness among the peoples of any and every country. They know too well that Nazi propaganda means misery, ruin and death.

"I am happy to learn that Catholics and Orthodox have expressed their gratitude to the Holy Father, Pius XII, for his efforts to relieve their sufferings. The Holy See has sent large sums to assist the Yugoslav peoples in their appalling distress. They all look to him to use his unique influence to protect them, as he has already endeavoured to do, against the threatened slaughter of their men, women and children, against the menace of the utter destruction of Belgrade with others of their cities.

"In conclusion, let me again pour out from the sincerity of a father's heart my sympathy for my fellow-Catholics of Croatia and Slovenia in the cruel martyrdom they are enduring. No less earnestly do we all sympathise with the Orthodox Christians in every part of Yugoslavia who are united with their Catholic fellow-patriots in a common suffering for justice' sake." (vid. *Orthodox Church Bulletin*, No. 5, January 1942.)

And again the following extract from a broadcast by Dr. Kuhar, a Catholic priest and head of the Information Office of the Yugoslav Government in London:—

"Grave news has been received to say that in certain parts of our country held by the Italo-German agent Pavelic, many Orthodox Christians have lately been forced by threats to become Catholic in order to save their lives.

"Catholic groups of importance in political life are also making enquiries into the reliability of this news which, if it is correct, is not only opposed to every principle of Catholic morality but will open smarting wounds that will impair the mutual settlement of the future Yugoslavia, where Catholic and Orthodox Christians should live and collaborate in a whole-hearted Christian love. The highest circles of the Catholic Church have therefore been asked to make an immediate investigation on the spot, and, if the news be correct, to take steps to preserve the principles of Catholic morality regarding the freedom of conscience and to prevent the pagan agents of a pagan enemy from sowing dissension between Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, which will cause animosity between religious organizations now and have fatal repercussions after the war.

"The Catholic teaching and Catholic practice in this respect are plain and obvious. Every force exerted against one's conscience is an immoral act.

"Religion is the most sacred right of every human being, a right which requires a free consent of the intellect and will. The changing of religions, unless it is undertaken by a free mind and of a free will and unless it is done for pure motives, is not only an act of immorality committed both by the individual changing his religions and the individual enforcing the change, but also an act which is permanently invalid. If the reports that our Orthodox brethren have been enforced by Pavelić's agents to take up Catholicism are true, these agents have committed an immoral act which can and will never be sanctioned by the Catholic Church. Our Orthodox brethren have not ceased by force to be Orthodox; they have not become Catholic. Such forced conversions are never valid.

"Calmly expecting the decisions of the highest Catholic authorities with regard to these events, all the Catholics of Yugoslavia, Croats and Slovenes, now as well as in the future want to live and collaborate with their Orthodox brethren in peace and love. Their sympathy goes out to all those whose freedom and conscience have been offended; they promise that none of the injustices wrought by force by the German and Italian agents will remain unrectified in our future united country. Yugoslavia will not be destroyed or dismembered by this most dangerous attempt of our enemy." (vid. *Orthodox Church Bulletin*, No. 6, March, 1942.)

CHURCH OF GREECE.

At the outbreak of war the Archbishop of Athens issued directions to his clergy to assist them in strengthening and encouraging their people. He laid special stress on the daily recital of Vespers and Matins and the daily celebration of the Divine Liturgy. (vid. *S.G.N.L.*, April, 1941.)

ANTIOCH.

The Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch has accepted the Gregorian Calendar. The differences outstanding between Greek and Arabic speaking populations are said to have been settled. Four new Metropolitans have been appointed. (*ibid.*, December, 1941.)

RUSSIA.

One thing this war has made clear is that Russia still lives in spite of the U.S.S.R. As Mr. Christopher Dawson has said: "It is not Communism that Hitler is attacking but Russia itself—a whole world with all its traditions and its social possibilities which are not limited by the dogmatic simplicity of the Communist ideology." ("The Russian War" in *The Czechoslovak Catholic Bulletin*, August, 1941.)

The following is taken from two articles by Russian Orthodox who both have a knowledge of the U.S.S.R. :

Mr. Lampert says that an acute affirmation of wholeness, opposition to all separation is one of the features of the Russian people (see "The Revelation of Russia" by E. Lampert in *The Christian News-Letter*, Supplement, November 5th, 1941). "Russian Communism is above all the acquisition of a unity and a centre in life. The world of West-European democracy is a world of almost complete freedom—freedom of thought, art, religion—of the whole of culture. But this freedom has become aimless ; the culture has no centre."

"Our world," he says, "thirsts for wholeness, the struggle for dogma is more characteristic for all, even anti-religious movements to-day than the classical adogmatism of the Liberal school. Russia answers the need for a single centre in life."

"... Communism is inspired by the desire to create one all-embracing classless society. And Russian communist society has become a negative revelation of the religious ideal of the Russian Church. The Russian always thinks in the category of unity of being and the unity of men. Russian socialism is therefore the expression of the search for universal salvation, the reverse side of Russian religious collectivism. It must be realized that the Revolution brought a great and

unique gift to Russia: a new consciousness of unity, the sharing of the whole population in its history, the calling of all the masses to the struggle for a new life. She has never possessed this gift in such a measure as she does now."

"... The Russian Revolution and Russian Communism are also stained with guilt. The communist dream of a new happy life is not only truth but also demonism. This demonism makes the terrible attempt to render economic existence the sole reality of man's life, and thus debases his dignity. But we cannot recognize only stark hunger as the sole reality, and in its name deny man's spiritual vocation. Russian Communism, like the Russian Revolution, has therefore an anti-religious and anti-Christian character. It denied God, denied the Spirit, denied the supreme meaning of life." Yet "it would be false," he says, "to conclude from this that Christians should simply deny the communist Revolution, recognize no truth in it, range themselves on the side of 'counter-revolution.'"

"... It must not be forgotten that in the course of its whole rich history the Russian people lived by religion, but by its religious revelation, by its Church. Yet now over Soviet Russia there hangs the terrible banner of anti-religious propaganda. Religion is not dead, for it cannot be destroyed; but as those who live it die out, and in the face of the Government's direction of the education of youth, how can its very existence not be threatened? In this situation something had to happen—something which would tear out the very depth of contemporary Russian life. I am bold to say this is happening: it is the struggle in which Russia is now engaged." (All quotations are from the above, in fact this is in great part a summary of the article.)

Here is a somewhat different picture of Church life in the U.S.S.R.

In explaining the term "*sobórnost'* of the *Pravoslavnyye*," Madame de Beausobse says that *Pravoslavnyye* is best translated by *Right Glorification*: is not man himself, when he is such as he should be, the chief glorification of his Creator? "This has undoubtedly always been assumed by Russian Christians, but it has acquired a new significance in their actual environment. . . ."

"Living in the iron grip of a mechanized tyranny, the Christian can do nothing to change the world around him; and the State sees to it that he enjoys neither leisure nor privacy of a kind which he could openly devote to welding himself into a creature capable of one day becoming a glorification of its Creator. And yet the urge is imperative—where there is none—not three, nor two, nor even one—to glorify God

by being what man should be, there is no laity ; where there is no laity there can be no Church ; and where there is no Church there is no Christianity." (This is not intended to exclude the clergy but only shows the Russian conception of almost identifying the laity with the Church.)

Having shown the attitude of mind of the individual Russian Christian, another fact must be borne in mind, viz., "Church practice is not forbidden in the U.S.S.R. as it was in ancient Rome, or in France during the Revolution. There have been weeks, even months when it seemed that history was repeating itself, but, now that there is a sweep of twenty-five years to look back upon, I think we can say that in Russia the situation is a different one. I do not in any way wish to imply that it is better ; but it is a different one. Church practice is bitterly ridiculed and made dangerous, very dangerous, to priest and laity. It is, indeed, a constant menace to their freedom and their lives. But it is not forbidden." And on the part of the Christian the importance of open liturgical testimony is widely and generally recognised. "It is felt that Church practice must not be secret, and the churches are kept above ground. . . ."

"The sequence of thought is thus : church services are the outer expression and affirmation of corporate religion : corporate religion the safeguard against *wrong solitude*, the kind of solitude which is a weakness, not a force ; but if each one is to pull his full weight in the corporate action, every one must strive with all his might to glorify God rightly." (vid. article, "The New Catacombs" by Julia de Beausobre in *Sobornost*, June, 1941.)

The above gives greater significance to the following statement.

"The Metropolitan Sergius and his Council are now in Uljanovsk—formerly known as Simbrisk—on the Volga, where they retired when the Soviet Government went to Kuibishev. The Moscow diocese is therefore at present administered by the Metropolitan Nicholas of Kiev. Forty parishes are known to be flourishing in Moscow to-day, as against twenty-five at the time of the German attack last year, and fifteen in 1939. In spite of the evacuation of the capital, it is clear that many churches have recently been re-opened." (*The Tablet*, March 21st, 1942.) These extracts suggest hope for the future of Russia !

"May He who rose from the dead, Christ our True God, through the intercession of His undefiled Mother, have mercy upon us and save us ; for He is good and loveth mankind." (Byzantine Liturgy.)

NEWS AND COMMENTS

The Eastern Churches Quarterly has, on account of present circumstances, had to change the quality of its paper. This will therefore seem an opportune moment to change into a *new Volume* with the present issue. An index of Vol. IV will be sent out with our next issue.

Any of our readers who have back numbers *that they do not want* are asked to send them to the Editor, since a number of back numbers were lost when our publisher's premises were destroyed by enemy action.

We offer our filial duty and prayers to our Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, on the occasion of the jubilee of his consecration as bishop. *Ad multos annos!* Among other things the Pope made an appeal for Christian Unity in his broadcast.

We wish to congratulate Dr. Temple on his translation from the See of York to that of Canterbury, thereby becoming the foremost bishop of the Anglican Communion. His previous work and experience fits him for this most important position; may he set himself with all seriousness to bear in mind the problem of what the Lambeth Conference of 1930 called *the great Latin Church of the West* in any future scheme of reunion.

REVIEW OF REVIEWS

This will, in the case of most reviews, be confined to a very brief notice. Exceptions to this made blow are due to the matter having more direct bearing on present problems.

CATHOLIC REVIEWS.

Many of these have stopped publication for the present.

Theological Studies, New York. We will review this excellent journal in the next issue.

Voice of the Church. (Monthly.) 1941. This is the official organ of the Slavonic Apostolate in the United States, published at St. Procopius Abbey, Lisle, Illinois.

There are a series of articles by Prince Max of Saxony, "Meditation on the Agia Sophia of Constantinople." They deal with the building and subsequent history of Justinian's great church by one who is an expert on things Byzantine. There are various articles by Serge Bolshakoff, a Russian Orthodox who has made Church Unity his life's work. Also some articles on the history of the nascent Russian Catholic Church by Prince P. M. Volkonsky. The journal is certainly spreading interest in the Eastern Churches among Catholics while at the same time it takes a sympathetic and an understanding attitude to the problem of reunion.

Blackfriars. (February, 1942.) This is again a number dealing with Christian Unity. The outstanding article is that of Fr. Victor White, "The Effects of Schism." It was written, he tells us, at the request of a group of Anglican Papalists and is intended as a complement to his previous article on "Membership of the Church" (*Blackfriars*, September, 1941). His subject is not "*Who* is in schism?" but "*What* is the practical outcome of being in schism?" He treats the question with great clearness and completeness based on the authority of St. Thomas. We think, however, that the real connection between baptism and the Holy Eucharist should have been given notice; this connection at least is one of the purposes of baptism that schism cannot not preclude from where there is a valid priesthood.

The reminder in the footnote (p. 50), that in reading Catholic theology the words "heretic" and "schismatic" are always to be understood of those who are consciously and wilfully such, is important.

Father McNabb comments on two Anglican writers in *Theology* (August and October, 1926) on "St. Peter in the New Testament."

A very favourable review of "The High Church Tradition" is given by Father Conrad Pepler. The history and growth of the "Church Unity Octave" is dealt with by Father Keldany, and "The Prayer of Jesus," an ancient Eastern form of prayer, by Mrs. Gorodetzky.

Russia and the West. This will be dealt with in our next issue.

NON-CATHOLIC REVIEWS.

Sobornost'. (May-December, 1940 and June-December, 1941.) This review has (as we have) been forced to come out but twice a year.

By far the most interesting subject brought forward in these numbers is that under the heading of "The Fellowship and Anglo-Orthodox Intercommunion." The question had been put by Father Bulgakov at the seventh Anglo-Russian Conference in June 1933; the suggestion was that *within the Fellowship*, since there was a common bond of dogmatic faith and a common belief that the succession of the priesthood had been retained in their respective churches, the members, whether Orthodox or Anglican, should be able to go to Holy Communion at one another's altars.

The question was posed in this way for discussion: "Is the canonical boundary of the Church also her charismatic boundary, and is it possible to define it finally in purely canonical terms and categories?" It was claimed that "Intercommunion" *already* existed in the fact of common worship, in the "sacrament of prayer," so why could not a special canonical authorization on both sides be given so that they might enter into Eucharistic Intercommunion?

At the discussion of the question during the next year's Conference the points raised against the thesis were: that the proposal would do more to injure than to help the cause of Reunion; that the members of the Fellowship did not represent their respective Churches as a whole; real intercommunion cannot be achieved by unofficial and individual groups, and that "partial" intercommunion is in itself a contradiction in terms.

On the other hand it was argued in favour of the thesis that "reunion cannot be achieved merely between the higher organs of the hierarchy, without any active participation of the people of the Church." "If reunion is not mere absorp-

tion through submission to ecclesiastical authority, but is true *integration*, then a certain free, spontaneous, 'molecular' movement towards it must be admitted."

Opposition, however, to the suggestion was too strong and so it was considered that the time was not yet ripe (that was in 1935) to realize it.

It is in the *Sobornost* of May 1940 that the question is again raised, the result of which was that a questionnaire was sent to a number of members of the Fellowship. Answers have been sent in and are commented on by Mr. Lampert (in December 1940 and June 1941), though the Editor states that these opinions do not necessarily represent the official outlook of the Fellowship or of its journal.

We are afraid that space will not allow us to go into these very interesting and suggestive comments of Mr. Lampert. We hope at a future date to deal with them as they deserve. We note in particular his moderate view of the principle of "Economy" (vid. May 1940, p. 14), and we tentatively suggest that it might be possible to consider the "Partial Intercommunion" here treated of from the aspect of a Uniate Church (though by no means in every case)!

Of the other articles there are two by Mrs. Gorodetzky: "War and Reunion," (December 1940) and "Worship in Reunion Movements" (June 1941). Both are valuable and well documented studies. In the December issue of 1941 the Rev. Patrick Thompson contributes an article, "The Tradition in the Traditions," being a study of Catholic worship in the Anglican (though here he identifies the Anglican with the Western Tradition!) and Orthodox Churches. It is excellently done.

There are many more articles of interest and information. One last must be mentioned, as it has rather a special interest, that of Dr. Zernov, "The Eucharist of the Eastern Rite and the Anglican Church" (June 1941.) This is the presentation on behalf of the President and Emergency Committee of the Fellowship of the suggestion that some Anglican priests be authorised to celebrate according to the Eastern Rite (Byzantine Rite to be exact) on certain occasions. Such a celebration would not be considered in the light of intercommunion and Anglicans would only be allowed to receive Holy Communion. The purpose of this action would be to make the following points explicit:

(1) "First, to demonstrate on behalf of the Anglicans their full endorsement of the traditional interpretation of Christianity contained in the ancient Eastern Eucharist: teaching which has the authority of the undivided Church, and which

has never been repudiated or questioned by the Anglican or by the Roman communions.

(2) "Secondly, to express in a most impressive way the bond of unity and brotherly love rapidly growing between the Anglicans and the Eastern Orthodox. The Easterns regard their Eucharistic rite as the most sacred and beloved of all their treasure, and the devout and loving acceptance of it by the Anglicans would show them that the Anglicans love and venerate the same thing which is so highly valued by the Easterns.

(3) "To give a concrete lesson to the Anglicans themselves of the universality of their Church. The Anglican communion includes many races and nations, and there is a growing number of different Eucharistic rites used by Anglicans in different countries, but they all derive their origin from the same source: the Second Prayer Book. The celebration of the Eastern Eucharist will break new ground and connect the Anglican Church both with the present generation of Eastern Christians and with all those members of Christ's Church who in the past centuries, in many different lands and in many different tongues, worshipped God in accordance with the venerable tradition of Eastern Orthodoxy.

"This step, if it is made in the right spirit (and this means after a careful devotional and theological preparation and with the sanction of the proper Church authorities), will enlarge the spiritual horizon, ease party tensions, and help an average member of the Church to see how much greater, richer and fuller is the life and worship of the Christian community than he usually realizes. It also will considerably accelerate the work for Anglo-Orthodox rapprochement, for there are only few Orthodox priests available in England, and the number of services celebrated by them is bound to be very limited."

We have quoted this in full (though it is by no means the whole article) because whether the suggestion be adopted or not it sets forth in the main the line of argument and gives the very reasons why Pope Pius XI himself advocated the policy of allowing certain Western priests to adopt the various Oriental rites. It cannot be too strongly insisted upon that the reasons that prompted Pope Pius XI to this measure were those of a real and a deep appreciation of the cause of reunion with the Eastern Churches. With him, as with all recent Popes, it has not been a policy of "absorption" but of dogmatic unity and of liberty in regard to rite and all the cultural and spiritual significance that is embodied in that term, although given cases can be quoted where the local

Latin bishops or clergy, or even the Orientals themselves (a minority in the midst of Latin Catholic neighbours) have advocated certain "latinizations" and failed to understand their native Eastern Traditions.

Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift. We hope to review this in our next issue.

Stephen Graham's News Letter, London. (Monthly), 1941. The editorial is always of interest and sometimes stimulating. The report of news in the various countries is bound to be of a too uncertain nature in these days. One could not keep pace with events in the Near East in 1941. In spite of this, a number of facts have been collected which will be of future use.

Orthodox Church Bulletin, London, 1941. This news sheet has lately been published by the Ministry of Information (Religious Division). It gives us important and useful information.

Reunion. (June-December, 1941.) In these issues Mr. Brandreth deals with "The Œcumenical Ideals of the Oxford Movement" in two articles. The Rev. T. G. Jalland gives us an interesting study of "The Tolerance of the Roman See" in the June issue. The review retains its high standard both as regards content and production in spite of the present difficulties.

The Pilot. (Monthly), 1941. This is the official organ of *The Society for Promoting Catholic Unity*, the governing body of which is the *Council for Promoting Catholic Unity*, which council is in its turn formed from the representatives of four other organizations all of which have as their object Corporate Reunion under the Holy See. So we see that *The Pilot* represents a fairly strong body of opinion. There is still another Anglican Papalist group, i.e., of *The Society for Catholic Reunion*, working mostly in the North Midlands, who have their own paper, *The Bond of Peace*, and who are independent of the Council. *The Pilot* is a small paper (some eight pages) but devoted to this great cause. There is always news concerning the Church Unity Octave, and also articles by such veteran reunionists as the Rev. Spencer Jones, Rev. Fynes-Clinton and the Rev. Baverstock. A very instructive series of six articles, "Understanding and Misunderstanding" by Rev. Spencer Jones, gives a fairly close study of the sixteenth

century and England's break with Rome. The bearing of the background (*e.g.*, the Black Death, the Great Schism (1378-1417) and the Wars of the Roses), on the reign of Henry VIII is well brought out, though it in no way removes the guilt from the King.

Another series deals with leading Anglicans who have become reconciled with Rome, viz., Cardinal Newman, H. M. M. Evans of St. Michael's, Shoreditch, Fr. Vernon Johnson. There is nothing bitter but a straight-forward explanation as to why they *left us*. On the other hand we think the Rev. Baverstock (in April No.) does not fully appreciate Dr. Holland's article "The Anglican Papalists" in *The Clergy Review* sufficiently. It is by no means easy for an English Catholic priest, or any Catholic priest for that matter, to treat the Anglican Papalists' position seriously, let alone to try and *understand* it. Dr. Holland has done both, even though he may not have taken the attitude desired; to admit and encourage what he terms a "social reunion" is something (the article has been dealt with in the *E.C.Q.*, January and April, 1941). The same writer (July number) has a very interesting account of a talk he had with Mgr. Celso Constantini on the question of reunion; an Irish Carmelite assisted by way of interpreter. Both Catholic priests showed great sympathy.

To understand *The Pilot* fully and what it stands for see the tractate *Anglican Papalists* by Rev. D. Hole, this is reviewed on another page.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

DR. HOLLAND AND THE ANGLICAN PAPALISTS.

Reply to Dr. Holland.

DEAR REV. FATHER,

In your letter of May the 11th of last year (vid. our last issue), you raise a number of points; these we can only answer in as brief a manner as possible.

Fact 1. This is answered below by two letters from Anglican clergymen.

Fact 2. *We* certainly have got to do *most* of the supplying the need, but we can also *help* other Christian bodies (especially Anglican) to do their own part of the work.

Fact 3. The best answer to this is to quote from a paper of Mgr. M. d'Herbigny, S.J., read at Cambridge in 1923. He says: "After twenty years' observation, it is my conviction that Providence is bringing about the gradual return of all who remain really and positively Christian, whether Anglican or Orthodox. England and the East react one upon the other; for while English influence tends to break down Oriental prejudice against the West, the East tends to check and to extinguish the Protestant heresies of England." (vid. *The Papacy*, edited by Rev. C. Lattey, S.J., p. 85. W. Heffer and Sons, Cambridge.) Much has happened since then in the right direction.

The Newman Quotation. When we said that "a great change in the direction of Catholic outlook has come over the Anglican episcopate since the days of Newman" (*E.C.Q.*, Jan.-April, 1941, p. 268), we were thinking of the Catholic attitude to the Church (not specially the Papacy), and the Sacraments, and the consequences of the Incarnation, *e.g.*, a fuller realization of the position of Our Lady. We would agree also with your remarks under (a).

In regard to (b) and (c) we think two facts should be borne in mind. (1) There has been and still is (among the ecumenical movement) a "reunion" outlook after the manner of a confederation of Churches (this is condemned by the *Mortalium animos*), those who take this view certainly bear the marks of a liberal theology. This, we think, cannot last; it will lead to disintegration and the more positive elements, it is to be hoped, will find a home in the *Catholica*. (2) We have every reason to think, at any rate within the Church of England, that the *fashion* of liberal theology is a thing of the past, the publication of the series of books known as *Signposts* (1940) by some of the younger Anglican theologians,

and the recent volumes of the review *Theology* are indications of this.

(d) We think the attitude of the Anglican bishops to Rome is that they are only just beginning to make any *real* contact. Cardinal Hinsley's general attitude has done much in this direction. What Anglicans (even Anglican Papalists) ask is that Rome should give some further *explanations* in regard to the decrees of the Vatican Council and they hope for some future Council; they do not imagine that Rome can change her *dogmatic* position.

As regards the last word, we only would plead that Catholics should make more of a distinction between essentials and non-essentials.

Yours sincerely,

THE EDITOR.

To the Editor.

PUSEY HOUSE,
OXFORD.
May 8th, 1942.

DEAR FATHER EDITOR,

Perhaps it may be of some use for an Anglican to intervene in the interesting discussion between Dr. Holland and yourself. The workings of the Anglican Communion must no doubt always be puzzling to those outside and I am not surprised that Dr. Holland should fall into what seems to me a patent mistake of fact in suggesting that doctrinal discipline is likely to be more effective under a state establishment than in a non-established province. His view sounds paradoxical to any Anglican who knows how much more doctrinally homogeneous the non-established Anglican churches are than the Church of England, precisely because in them the state cannot intervene, by controlling ecclesiastical courts and in other ways, to hinder doctrinal authority. In England it has repeatedly done this: the Gorham Judgment and the *Essays and Reviews* case are two outstanding examples. Nor is the Colenso affair a very happy example of Dr. Holland's thesis, as its history shows.

No doubt there are two sides to this question. The influence of the state has been by no means one-sided and every Anglican party has benefited at one time or another from its intervention. Thus the Denison and Bennett cases saved High Church sacramental doctrine from condemnation: what might have happened at that time in a disestablished church can be illustrated from the censure of Bishop Forbes's eucharistic teaching in the state-free Episcopal Church of Scotland. The

most perfervid Anglo-Catholic advocate of spiritual independence may therefore hesitate to regret whole-heartedly the Establishment's interference with doctrinal discipline. But this in no way overthrows the general fact, which all Anglican history supports, that, *ceteris paribus*, dogmatic discipline is enervated by establishment and is most effective where there is no state connection. Indeed I should not limit this conclusion to Anglican experience. Does not the long history of Byzantium teach the same lesson?

Yours sincerely,

THOMAS M. PARKER.

35, SELBY ROAD,
EALING, W.5.
April 28th, 1942.

DEAR REV. FATHER,

Will you allow me to comment upon the letter of Dr. Holland which appeared in the October issue of your Quarterly (p. 318)?

Dr. Holland contends "that if there is no state-interference in the parts of Anglicanism not contained in the Establishment, there is much less chance of there being any dogmatic discipline among them"; and he cites the Colenso case of 1863 as a proof of this. "There is," he says, "no machinery at all for excommunicating a Heretic."

The Colenso case appears to me to show the exact contrary. The facts are as follows:—

Dr. Colenso, Bishop of Natal, was what we should now call a Modernist. In 1863 he was presented to the Metropolitan on a charge of heresy, by the Dean of Capetown and two Archdeacons.

The Metropolitan (Archbishop Grey of Capetown), in accordance with the canon law, summoned the other bishops of the Province as his Assessors, and cited the Bishop of Natal to appear and answer the charges made against him. The bishop refused, and made a formal protest against the proceedings. The Court, after careful investigation, found him guilty, and sentenced him to deprivation.

Bishop Colenso thereupon appealed to the Privy Council. The Privy Council did not attempt to adjudicate upon the merits of the case, as it asserted that the ecclesiastical law of England did not apply to the Colonies, but it gave judgment that the bishop's oath of Canonical Obedience to the Metropolitan was not binding in law, and that therefore the sentence of deprivation was null and void.

The clergy of the diocese of Natal upheld the Metropolitan's spiritual authority, and accepted the deprivation of Bishop Colenso. The Bishop, however, forced his way into the Cathedral in spite of a formal protest from the Dean and Churchwardens.

The Metropolitan then proceeded to issue a formal sentence of excommunication, which was read by the Dean from the Altar of the Cathedral. The clergy and laity of Natal, under the presidency of the Dean, proceeded to elect a new Bishop, who was consecrated in Capetown Cathedral by the Metropolitan.

The proceedings had doubtless been hampered by the fact that the South African bishops had hitherto been appointed by royal letters patent and the consequent right of appeal to the Privy Council. But in 1870 the Province of South Africa decided to cut the last links which bound it to the English Parliamentary "Establishment," and to free itself from all Erastian control. The Provincial Synod proceeded to draw up the Constitution and Canons by which the Church should henceforth be governed. No more Letters Patent were to be accepted from England. Bishops were to be elected and consecrated according to the Canon Law of the Province. The interpretation of the standards of Faith and Doctrine was referred to the spiritual courts of the Province, and all bishops and clergy entered into a contract to obey the decisions of these courts. The legislation of the Church was placed in the hands of the Provincial Synod, subject to a General Synod of the whole Anglican Communion, should such ever be held. (See *The English Church in South Africa*, by Archdeacon Wirgman.)

This, I think, entirely disposes of Dr. Holland's contention.

Yours faithfully,

DONALD HOLE.

ENGLISH COLLEGE,

LISBON,

May 14th, 1942.

DEAR FATHER EDITOR,

The July-October 1941 number has just arrived and I hasten, even at this date, to answer Fr. White's kind letter.

I have to defend my distinction between the Roman Catholic Church and all other churches whatsoever. The one I called "conjoint instrument of the action of the Holy Ghost," the others "separated instruments." This is found to sort ill with St. Thomas's use of the terms, and so to be either gravely misleading, or useless at best.

(i) It is patristic, papal, and scholastic doctrine that the

Holy Apostolic Roman Church is the Mystical Body of Christ on earth and that the Holy Ghost is the Soul of the Mystical Body, and therefore "the communication of the Holy Ghost, the participation of truth and life is not obtained unless in the Church and through the Church" (Vatican Shema, c. 6, Coll. Lac. 7, 569).

(ii) The negative conclusion of this doctrine is explicitly asserted by the Fathers from the beginning: if you are outside the Church (the Holy Apostolic Roman Church) the Spirit does not animate you. The expression of this is varied and vivid—broken branch, amputated hand, etc., but sums up in the classic formula: "*extra ecclesiam nulla salus*."

(iii) When therefore people who are not under the organic action of the Holy Spirit are reached by Him (and it was my anxiety to imply the positive fact that they are) this can only be in so far as the organism to which they belong (of itself not an instrument of life) is somehow put into actual contact with the Catholic Church—not in a permanent, vital way: but here and now, for this or that act, in virtue of these or those exculpating dispositions in agent and recipient; so that the action of the Church is prolonged by the lifeless organ, as a stick lengthens the reach of the hand.

(iv) St. Thomas announces just that as the general distinction between conjoint and separated instruments (v.g. S.T. 3, 62, 5 corp.): a separated instrument has itself to be moved by the communicated motion of a conjoint instrument. To be sure he particularizes his use of the distinction to the Sacred Humanity in reference to means of grace, but the mere announcement of the distinction as having a general sense means that it need not be stereotyped in one particular application.

(v) The suggestion that my use of the distinction tends to erect the Church into hypostatic union with the Holy Ghost, arises, I think, from the assumption that St. Thomas *has* stereotyped the application. Perhaps Fr. White will exercise his legitimate right to differ on that and on other grounds. I cannot help feeling that apart from the break with St. Thomas which I have tried to explain, the other doubts hinted at by my kind critic could all be levelled at the doctrine given in the first point above: the Holy Spirit is the Soul of the Church. And that does not need defence from

Yours, etc.,

THOMAS HOLLAND.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

The High Church Tradition. By G. W. O. Addleshaw. pp. 197.
(London : Faber and Faber). 7s. 6d.

The book before us deserves to have a wide circulation and we could wish as many Catholics would read it as possible, because it will give them quite a different outlook on the Book of Common Prayer than they normally have and hence a much greater appreciation and understanding of the historical and liturgical position of Anglicanism. This does not mean that the book should escape criticism. No, fair criticism would indeed enhance its value. We would like to see one as well versed in the writings of the sixteenth century Anglican divines as Mr. Addleshaw tell us whether his interpretation of these divines is in agreement with our author, or whether other quotations from these same sixteenth century writers might not present a different line of argument. Criticism of this kind we think may be forthcoming on the part of the Anglicans themselves. But, although an examination of this kind might tell, in some way, for or against the author, Mr. Addleshaw will still have rendered very valuable service to the cause of Christian unity by this liturgical study.

Mr. Addleshaw, in giving us a study of the liturgical thought of the seventeenth century, by no means confines himself to a period picture ; he treats his subject from the point of view of fundamental liturgical principles and shows a good knowledge of the Catholic Liturgical Movement on the Continent. These principles are set out in the Introduction. Having traced the growth and spread of individualism and the secularist view of dogma and being, he states the liturgical outlook of the Church thus :

“Dogma, prayer and life, all three have been isolated ; and in isolation their power and glory have vanished and withered away. The Church, if it is to win the fight against modern paganism, and not only win the fight but heal the wounds inflicted by this paganism on man’s nature, needs re-integration, and new wholeness, in which the dogma, the prayer and the life form a living unity. It is true that in the Church of England there is an increasing desire, not confined to any one school of thought, to give once more a dogmatic basis to political and working life ; but little is said about the vital connection between the community, its life and organization, the work its members do, and the life of worship. Often too this attempt at re-integration is amorphous and lacking in any practical result, because it has never got beyond talk ; it has failed to find any point of contact where dogma, prayer, and life

all meet, any one definite action which is the meeting-place of eternal truth, and the sweat and toil of humanity. Man needs to see such an action, which will not only integrate his working life into the eternal world, but also give him a vision of what that working life should truly be" (p. 17). He then mentions the Liturgical Movement and says :—

"It is in the light of the Liturgical Movement that the traditional High Church emphasis on the Prayer Book takes on a new colour and is seen to possess a meaning for our generation" (p. 18).

Surely this shows a most satisfactory outlook on a vital problem that confronts Christians to-day, and it may be said that Mr. Addleshaw has grasped the central importance of the Eucharist in a way that many of us would do well to imitate ! It also always seems to us satisfactory when dealing with the traditions of Anglicanism to start with the seventeenth century since one thereby avoids the controversy of the Reformation period and is dealing with a theological thought that certainly is of the Church of England.

It is another question as to how far Mr. Addleshaw will carry the clergy and the laity of the Church of England with him. This question may be especially asked of those Anglicans who are most Catholic minded and who pride themselves on their adherence to the traditions and development of the Western Church and who fight shy of a too national interpretation of Catholic worship. Yet it may well be that if, in working out his theories into practice Mr. Addleshaw, sits lightly on those parts of his argument that are dated, and perhaps archaic, he will gain a hearing precisely because he is dealing with fundamental principles that go far deeper than much of the externals of practice. These same principles, be it said, will be found (though in a completer way) embodied in the tradition of the Roman Church. We cannot help feeling that some sort of constructive policy between such men as Mr. Addleshaw and the Anglican Papalists would do both parties good and help forward the cause of Christian Unity in England ; such a synthesis, a co-operation (not a compromise) in the study of the Anglican Divines and their relation to the teaching of the Fathers of the Church, and again this in relation to the living current of Western Tradition would be of great value. This, in so far as it is theory put into some practical liturgical application (not necessarily uniform) would be some guidance to the youth of the Church of England and elsewhere and so some preparation for Catholic Unity might be begun.

DOM BEDE WINSLOW.

Anglican Papalists. By Donald Hole. (S.P.C.U. Tractates). pp. 28. 1s.

However much one may admire the Anglican Papalists for their courageous and realistic attitude in the cause of Christian Unity; however much one may respect the learning of many of the writers of this group, one is nevertheless left with the impression that their position is almost untenable by the ordinary sincere Englishman who practises his religion.

This opinion is, we think, shared in both by Catholics and Anglicans alike: the Anglican Papalist position seems to them the product of some special psychological process which the average man simply fails to understand.

To all such, and specially to all Catholic priests, we recommend this little book. One may not agree with every detail, but the author has, we think, certainly made his position quite clear and, we would say, tenable for Anglicans.

Mr. Hole shows both learning and a clear insight into all the difficulties which the position presents. He also deals with the course of events in a straightforward way, taking everything into account and throwing a new light on one or two points (*e.g.*, the word *Protestant*, p. 10).

There are, however, two comments we feel we ought to make. First, we would say that individual secession does not "necessarily involve the denial of everything else and the negation of a positive and special experience and the whole record of a life behind them" as suggested on p. 23 (3). We also think that even in this short tractate, a little fuller treatment of the present-day Anglican Papalist body should have been given and that Associations other than the S.P.C.U. should have been mentioned.

We will end this brief note both by thanking the author for his valuable work (some of the same ground was covered in an article—"Negotiations for Reunion between England and Rome," by B.R.W., in *PAX*, September, 1912. The present work is, however, clearer and more to the point), and hoping it will be widespread and so do much good work for the great cause:—*ut omnes unum sint!*

DOM BEDE WINSLOW.

The Nature of Catholicity. By Daniel T. Jenkins. (Faber and Faber). 5s.

This book, we are told, "is intended primarily to promote the discussion between Reformed and Catholic Anglican theologians, which the author regards as the most important and fruitful now engaging our minds in England" (p. 16). Inasmuch as the discussion marks the beginning of what is

perhaps the first serious attempt—on a rigorously theological as distinct from a predominantly pragmatic or sentimental basis—to bridge the chasms with which the upheavals of the sixteenth century rent Western Christendom, this estimate of the importance of the discussion is hardly extravagant. Canon Ramsey's *The Gospel and the Catholic Church* may be said to have initiated the discussion. The present volume, by an able young Congregationalist theologian, takes up the interchange from the standpoint of an uncompromising but open-minded Evangelicalism of markedly "Barthian" complexion.

Into this important (but as yet rather exclusive) discussion, a Catholic reviewer can enter only with the embarrassing sense of being, in Mr. Jenkins' eyes, an incompetent intruder, incapable, by the very fact of his allegiance, of the *sine-qua-non* of fruitful intercourse—the readiness to stand under the judgment of the Word of God. There are indeed moments when Mr. Jenkins shows a rare insight into the deeper significance of the most commonly misunderstood Catholic dogmas, as when he writes (p. 42) of the "Roman claim which is, after all, only to an infallible definition of the Gospel." This recognition might be supposed to qualify the Catholic Church in communion with the Holy See to come within the author's honourable category of "the Reformed Churches," which he defines as including "all Churches which officially accept the principle of Reformation according to the Word of God" (p. 9). But in a regrettably ambiguous passage (ambiguous because the "voice of the Pope" is *never* the "voice of Christ *simpliciter*") he finds a wide cleavage between "Roman doctrine" and contemporary Catholic practice in this very matter (p. 86). It cannot be said that this cleavage exists solely in Mr. Jenkins' fancy; but nor can it be said that he is much better satisfied with Catholic doctrine than he is with much existing Catholic practice. He finds in the doctrine of transubstantiation "one of the points where the Roman Catholic misconception of the relation between Christ and His Church is most startlingly revealed" (p. 74), and his final estimate of "Roman Catholicism"—while refreshing in its outspokenness in these days of mealy-mouthed indifferentism—is discouraging to the Catholic would-be participant in this discussion. For "Roman Catholicism has succeeded in ruling out the possibility of reformation by its very constitution. The heretical Bishop of Rome is a figure of almost cosmic proportions. . . . It is at least intelligible how Luther thought of the Pope as antichrist . . ." (pp. 84, 85).

The temptation must be resisted of concentrating on these more negative asides in the book; they prove on analysis to

be but corollaries of its central thesis. It should perhaps be said that the title of the book is possibly misleading. Of the distinctive "Note" of Catholicity there is little in it from beginning to end, while there is much more concerning Unity, Holiness (and still more, Unholiness) and Apostolicity. Indeed, within the limitations of his frame of reference, it is hardly possible for the author to give to Catholicity any significance bearing any close relation to its etymological and theological meaning, and he is content to use it throughout as little more than a synonym for orthodoxy, which for him means primarily acceptance of the principle of Reformation. From the very first chapter, the centre of gravity in the discussion is switched over to Apostolicity. And rightly, for in this discussion the question of authority and its relation with commission through historical succession is fundamental.

Yet it is just here that the book disappoints us. While it marks a real advance in regard to what are candidly recognised as secondary issues (notably in Ch. IV), and in the whole spirit of its manner of approach, it cannot be said that, regarding this crucial issue, it makes any appreciable advance. The author fully recognises the insufficiencies of the ecclesiology of historic Protestantism, and is eager to learn how historic Catholicism may supply those deficiencies. But concerning the character of the Apostolate and the historic ministry, he leaves matters pretty well where they were. He emphasises, and rightly, that here the concept of *testimony* is fundamental. But he fails entirely even to consider the *differentia* of the Apostolate as the *accredited* and *commissioned* organ of testimony—a *differentia* to which the very name apostle bears witness, together with many oft-quoted passages of the Gospels, Acts and Epistles—not to speak of early Church writers. This grave defect, already apparent in his over-facile review of the New Testament witness, becomes glaring when (with the aid of a strangely disingenuous quotation from Hoskyns) he disposes of the Ignatian conception of the Episcopate. All this belongs to the well-trodden paths of Catholic-Protestant polemic, and it is perhaps unfortunate that this material should not have had the consideration it deserves in Canon Ramsey's eirenicon. For this important discussion must inevitably become deflected from the real point at issue if this material, for all its tedious triteness, is overlooked.

A Catholic observer of this discussion cannot fail to note a strange myopia here, and he will seek to penetrate into its deeper dogmatic sources. It will be no more than a truism to Mr. Jenkins when we assert that differences on this issue, radical as it is, must be traced to still deeper cleavages in our

respective conceptions regarding the interrelation of Grace and Nature. Not seldom does Mr. Jenkins challenge the "Catholic-minded" with most pertinent questions in regard to their seriousness in acceptance of the Gospel; in return we are compelled to ask if "Dialectic" theologians generally take sufficiently seriously the implications of the Incarnation and the entry of the Divine into space and time. It is a question which is not without embarrassment in these days when "Incarnationalism" has become a term of reproach for a kind of sublimated naturalism, which we abhor as strongly as do Barth and his disciples. Sometimes we find ourselves bound to sympathize with Mr. Jenkins in his expressions of misgiving regarding the empiricist "historicism" of some manifestations of Anglo-Catholicism. With him we assert vehemently that the "merely historical" and the "merely geographical" are no revelation of the Word of God. Yet we cannot allow our repudiation of continuity "from below upwards" to weaken our affirmation of continuity "from above downwards," nor to prevent us from following the descent of the Word into time and space to its uttermost limits. Herein is to be found the inmost significance of our affirmation of an Apostolicity which postulates an accredited historical succession; from this affirmation a conception of justification by extrinsic imputation must ever preclude us. And herein again must ever lie the crucial issue between a Church which accepts the principle of Reformation from within and all communions which accept a principle of Reformation from without and which appeal to a Scripture which is conceived to stand outside and above the historic community and succession.

We believe that Mr. Jenkins will, in the main, accept this diagnosis of the ultimate source of our unhappy divisions, and will be as conscious as we are that his book fails to get behind it. Is it a hopeless impasse? It would be a bold man who would dare assert the contrary, yet may it not be that such frank interchange as this book typifies, conjoined with humble submission to divine judgment, may lead if imperceptibly to some readjustment of the deeper dogmatic prepossessions and cleavages?

However that may be, and in spite of many fundamental disagreements, we must welcome Mr. Jenkins' book as an important event. Together with its firm hold on principle it displays much shrewd appraisal of present concrete realities in the religious and irreligious life of these islands. We hope to hear from Mr. Jenkins again.

VICTOR WHITE, O.P.

Documents illustrative of the History of the Church. Vol. III. c. 500-1500. Edited by B. J. Kidd, D.D. (S.P.C.D., New York: The Macmillan Company). 1941. 7s. 6d.

The Editor of these Documents is the well known author of several works on ecclesiastical history, especially on the Orthodox Eastern Churches and on the Papacy, considered from the Protestant, more or less High-Anglican, angle. There are in this book 162 documents, covering a period of one thousand years of Church history. Obviously, an attempt at discussing each separately would be quite out of the question in this review. Only a few remarks of a general character seem called for here.

First, the Editor prefaces most of the documents with a few explanatory lines. Some of these are his own composition, others are excerpts from well known works, Catholic or non-Catholic. In justice to the compiler it should be stated that when these historical commentaries come from his own pen, they are for the most part unbiased. See, for example, that on St. Gregory VII on page 123. The same cannot be said of several others derived from historians whose views on such debated subjects as the papacy, the Eastern schism, and certain points of Catholic doctrine (e.g., the Eucharist) are not unprejudiced. Moreover, some of these writers are now out of date, even in non-Catholic circles.

Another drawback which one is bound to point out is that the documents are not given in the original Greek or Latin. When dealing with such delicate points of dogma, as, for example, the Eucharistic controversy between St. Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus, it is imperative to go back to the original texts. No translation does them justice. Even the few poetical pieces included in this anthology, although quite innocent of controversial issues, lose much in translation. Take, for instance, the *Vexilla Regis* of St. Venantius Fortunatus. Neale's rendering is a beautiful sample of English verse, but it is not the familiar *Vexilla Regis* of the liturgy. The fourth line of the first stanza "*Suspensus est patibulo*" is rendered as "Our sentence bore, our ransom paid"—obviously quite another thought.

Finally, there is the question of the criterion followed in the selection of the documents themselves. Naturally, all anthologies are the product of subjective views, but in a collection of documents illustrative of Church history the compiler's views, if allowed to intrude unduly, may easily render the whole book quite unbalanced. We cannot help thinking that the Editor of the present volume has left some *lacunae*, which should be filled in future editions. There are

no documents referring to such important events as the missions of St. Anscar to Scandinavia, of St. Adalbert to his compatriots of Bohemia, of the Camaldolese monks to Poland and Russia, of the Cistercians to Northern Germany and Finland, etc., or to the relations of the great Pope Silvester II with the incipient kingdom of Hungary. Some heretical movements, like that of the Adoptionists in Spain, which troubled the Frankish Empire under Charlemagne, are completely passed over. The Carthusians and the Cistercians get a hearing, but the Camaldolese, the Vallombrosans and the Cluniacs, who represent equally important trends of monastic observance, are entirely ignored. On the other hand, the relations between the East and the West receive, we think, too much consideration. It is true that at the present time the Orthodox Eastern Churches are the subject of keen historical interest in England, especially among High-Anglicans, but . . . *ne quid nimis* !

The compilation as it stands is not, in our opinion, a fair reflection of the history of the Catholic Church in all lands and nations, nor could we accept it as an accurate exposition of the external development of Catholic thought and doctrine in the Middle Ages.

DOM ROMANUS RIOS.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Sheed and Ward : *The Reformation in England, Edward VI.*
Abbé G. Constant.

S.C.M. Press : *A Christian Basis for the Post-War World.*

S.P.C.K. : *Revelation and Reunion.* G.W. Broomfield.
The Christian Church and the Soviet State.
Serge Bolshakoff.

Faber & Faber : *Children in Soviet Russia.*

Burns Oates : *Catholic Art and Culture.* E.I. Watkin.

Blackwell : *Report of the Proceedings at the Church Unity
Octave, Blackfriars, Oxford.*

Dacre Press, Westminster : *A Detection of Aumbries.*
Dom Gregory Dix.